

2-10-2006

2006-02-10 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, "2006-02-10 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2006). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 68.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/68

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.

[Approved March 10, 2006]

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO
MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
February 10, 2006
KU West Ballroom, 3:00 p.m.

Senators Present: Abueida, Biddle, Biers, Brill, Chen, Conniff, Courte, Doyle, C. Duncan, Eggemeier, Gudaitis, Gustafson, Hardie, Hileman, Johnson, Lasley, Meyers, Morton, Simmons, O'Gorman, Penno, Pestello, Poe, Phelps, Thimmes, R. Wells,

Senators Excused: Bullinger, DeMarco, Desmond, Doenges, Hausmann, Kloppenberg, Letavec, Mullins, J. Saliba, Seielstad, Singer, Turk, Wolff

Guests: A. Anderson, Bickford, B. Duncan, Farrelly, Pair, Patterson, Peñas-Bermejo, Untener, Westendorf

1. Opening Prayer: Senator Poe opened the meeting with a prayer sent by Monalisa Mullins who could not be present. The Senate contemplated the role of servant leadership.

2. Roll Call: Twenty-six of thirty-nine Senators were present.

3. Minutes:

December 2, 2005: Moved and seconded, minutes were approved as written.

January 6, 2006: Moved and seconded, minutes were approved with the correction of the date.

4. Announcements:

- Senator Biers announced that Senator Seielstad has agreed to serve as parliamentarian for the Academic Senate.
- The Senate welcomed Brad Duncan as a guest from Leadership UD.
- Senator Johnson announced a process for distribution of information about the work of the Senate. Academic Senate minutes will be posted to the website <<http://academic.udayton.edu/senate>> in unapproved form as soon as they are ready. They will be replaced by approved minutes as they become available. This will be clearly indicated. Approved and unapproved minutes will be widely distributed to the University community as required by the Constitution of the Academic Senate. Approved sub-committee minutes will be posted and distributed to the members of the Senate. Unapproved minutes of sub-committees should be sent to the members of that sub-committee and to Senators Johnson and Biers.

5. Approval of Standing Committee Membership:

Moved and seconded, the membership on the standing committees was approved as follows:

Academic Policies: Dr. James Biddle (Chairperson), Dr. Brian Conniff (WI06) for Dr. David Darrow, Dr. Christopher Duncan, Ms. Donna Gudaitis, Dean Patricia Meyers, Dean Mary Morton, Mr. Jack O'Gorman, Dr. Robert P. Penno, Dr. Joseph Saliba, Dr. Andrea Seielstad, Dr. Llewellyn Simmons, Dr. Sanford Singer, Dr. Rebecca Wells, Mr. Dean Wolff, Dr. Deborah Bickford (ex officio)

Faculty Affairs: Dr. Atif Abueida, Dr. David Biers, Dr. George Doyle, Dr. Elizabeth Gustafson, Ms. Lauren Hausmann, Dr. Patricia Johnson, Dean Lisa Kloppenberg, Dean Tom Lasley, Dr. Monalisa Mullins, Dr. Carolyn Roecker Phelps (Chairperson), Dr. Pamela Thimmes, Mr. Brian Turk, Prof. Joe Untener (ex officio)

Student Academic Policies: Dr. Mark Brill, Mr. Kevin Bullinger, Dr. Carl Chen, Dr. Dale Courte (Co-Chairperson), Dr. George DeMarco, Mr. Josh Desmond, Mr. Michael Doenges, Dean F. Thomas Eggemeier, Dr. Russell Hardie, Mr. Steven Hileman (Co-Chairperson), Mr. Craig Letavec, Dr. Danielle Poe, Dr. Tom Skill (ex officio)

6. [DOC I-06-01: Sense of the Senate Discussion for Change in the Timing of Election for Faculty Representatives to the Senate and Election of Officers of the Senate.](#)

Senator Biers introduced the discussion, indicating that the Senate would be doing a number of “Sense of the Senate” discussions this semester in order to provide opportunity for discussion about issues before they come to the Senate for decision. He reviewed the rational statement provided in the document under discussion at this meeting. The question is whether or not to change the timing of the election of faculty members to the Academic Senate so that their terms follow the academic year rather than the calendar year. The current process of electing faculty Senators in the Fall term to begin service in the Winter term began in order to allow continuity of Senate members in the budget discussions.

Senator Wells began the discussion by articulating the two issues that need to be balanced in the course of making this decision. The terms should facilitate the business of the Senate itself so that the Senate can be effective. The terms should not preclude faculty from taking a responsible and influential role, as partners in the governance of the institution, in the budgeting process.

A number of Senators spoke to both of these issues. Senator Doyle noted that student terms are currently for the academic year, and that having students and faculty on the same calendar might facilitate the work of the Senate. Senator Biers suggested that the current structure results in a mid-year lull in the work of the Senate as it reorganizes with new members. The Senate might be more effective with the continuity of the academic year. On the issue of the impact of the Senate on the budgetary process, Senator Doyle indicated that he believed that the Senate had had little impact in the 1990s, but Senator Wells indicated that in the 1980s the Senate had a strong voice in deliberations through participation of the Executive Committee on the ELC (Educational Leadership Council). Senator Gustafson asked about the current process of involvement of Senate officers in the budgetary process. Senator Biers said that in his capacity as President of the Senate he attends the meetings of the Provost Council. He indicated that the budget cycle is now on a summer-Fall-winter rotation. The vision and goals are discussed in the summer; in the Fall, each unit presents “wish list;” and in the Winter, budget decisions are finalized and

announced. He indicated that he believed that he had little ability to influence the process. Senator Pestello, Provost, summarized the operation of the ELC and indicated that the budget presentations that used to take place there now take place in the Provost Council. Senator Biers remarked that the Provost was open to discussions about how the Executive Committee could be more fully included in these discussions. Given the current budget cycle and the benefits of continuity of the Senate members over the academic year, Senator Wells suggested that the change would be a “win-win” situation.

Senator Biers asked for a “sense of the Senate.” Twenty-three members indicated that they favored moving the elections to the Winter term. No Senators opposed this.

The Senate then discussed whether the terms of current Senators should be extended or shortened to facilitate this transition. Senator Lasley suggested that for the sake of continuity and the understanding of the issues by the faculty members, lengthening terms seemed best. Senator O’Gorman suggested that half of the terms could be extended and half shortened. Senator Brill replied that shortening terms might be unconstitutional. Senator Duncan noted that it is difficult to find faculty willing to commit the time to serve on the Senate, so lengthening terms of those who are willing would be well-advised.

Senator Biers asked for a “sense of the Senate.” Twenty-three Senators indicated support for lengthening terms and no Senators indicated support for shortening terms.

The Senate then discussed when the new members of the Senate should take office and when the officers should be elected. Senator Hileman reported that the student elections take place such that the new members are in place April 1. Senator Biers noted that there is often much important business at the April meeting of the Senate, so new Senators should not take office until that work is completed. Senator O’Gorman suggested that there could be an early May meeting to convene the new Senate. Senator Duncan suggested that this meeting be convened immediately after the close of the final April meeting of the current Senate. Senator Biddle suggested that however this meeting was timed, it should be at the end of the Winter term and not at the beginning of the Fall term. Senator Hileman suggested that this could be an electronic vote. Senator Duncan noted that several ballots could be necessary for each office, so that an electronic process could be very drawn out. He also suggested that individuals might want to speak to their candidacy.

Senator Biers called for a “sense of the Senate.” Twenty-four Senators indicated that they preferred the new Senate convene immediately after the April meeting or at an additional meeting shortly thereafter. New officers should be elected at that meeting. No Senators opposed this process.

This issue is returned to the Faculty Affairs Committee for formulation for a vote of the Senate. Any proposal affirmed by the Senate will have to go to a vote of the faculty.

7. Standing Committee Reports:
Academic Policies

Senator Biddle reported that the Committee has met with ARSIC (Advising Report and Student Information Committee) and will be bringing forward a proposal for the vote of the Senate at the March meeting to change the late withdrawal policy for non-academic reasons. The change would delete the option of “change of career objectives” as an accepted reason and add the notation that documentation may be required. ARSIC has also asked that the Committee consider a proposal to not use academic rank for students. The Committee will consider this at its next meeting. They are also discussing the proposed University-wide promotion and tenure committee and may receive a proposal from the Calendar Committee about a change in the study day schedule.

Faculty Affairs

Senator Phelps reported that the Committee had discussed the election of faculty to the Senate and requested the “Sense of the Senate” discussion at today’s meeting. They are continuing to review the proposal concerning background checks for faculty hires. They will discuss a new draft of the proposed policy soon and may bring something to the March meeting of the full Senate. They are also continuing to review other possible constitutional changes and are currently reviewing section II... B., which deals with the three types of authority of the Senate. These are legislative, legislative concurrence, and consultation.

Student Academic Policies

Senator Hileman reported that the Committee is working on an honor pledge that they hope to bring to the Senate in March. They will then begin work on updating the academic dishonestly policy, which has not been revised since 1978, and so does not address issues of the use of electronic technologies.

8. Provost Committee Reports:

Senator Pestello reviewed the rationale for the constitution of these committees. He identified a number of foundational issues that had been unaddressed for some time and appointed a series of committees to look at these issues. Each committee is chaired by a member of the Provost Council and each has a Senator as a member. The committees that are addressing promotion and tenure and peer review were requested by the Board of Trustees.

Catholic and Marianist Mission and Identity

Senator Morton reported that the purpose of this Committee is to review the various committees, topics, and programs that address this topic and to identify what is lacking and where there is overlap. The Rector’s Council is currently completing a Marianist Interest Inventory. She is working with Kathleen Norman on this. This Committee met last year, but has not met this year. It was noted that the work of this Committee is completely separate from the Marianist Education working Group.

Department Finances—Summer Returns

Associate Provost Untener reported that the work of this Committee has been completed. The purpose of the Committee was to design a process for tracking Summer income and for reimbursing the various constituencies. The Committee recommended that income and expenses be tracked by department and College or School. Excess revenue after expenses and overhead will be returned with 50% going to the department generating the

returns and 50% going to the dean of that unit. This will begin with the closeout that will take place in Fall 06.

Faculty Grants and Sponsored Research

Senator Biers reported for Mickey McCabe. The charge of the Committee is five-fold:

- Address appropriate goals for faculty research
- Discuss incentives and infrastructure to support these goals
- Sustain current collaborations in the sciences and engineering
- Promote research collaborations and increase research/scholarship in the arts, humanities, social sciences, business and law,
- Increase RI research in areas outside of defense

The work of this Committee is subordinate to that of others and so has not moved very quickly. Senator Pestello noted that because of changes at the State level, there is now aggressive movement on some of these issues.

Evaluation of Faculty Teaching

Senator Biers reported for Steve Wilhoit. The Senate approved the policy that student evaluations may not be used as the sole means of evaluating teaching. The charge to this Committee was to review research on evaluation of faculty teaching and to develop an evaluation policy which does not solely rely on student evaluation of teaching (assumption: reliance on student evaluations affects academic rigor). The Committee has recommended separate sub-committees for the revision of student course evaluation and policy and to develop a set of guidelines governing faculty teaching for developmental purposes. They have redefined their charge to develop a University policy on evaluating faculty teaching for administrative Purposes (promotions, tenure, and merit). For Promotion and tenure they recommend:

- Student course evaluations for every class
- At least two peer reviews of classroom teaching and course materials
- At least one (1) chair or administrator evaluation
- At least one (1) self-evaluation
- Faculty-provided evidence of the quality of student learning

Guidelines for merit are more difficult. This discussion is on-going.

Grade Migration and Rigor

Senator Biers reported that the charge of the Committee was to review the literature on grade migration, examine UD historical data on grade migration, and engage in conversations on how to best address the issue of academic rigor. The Committee has developed a preliminary conceptual model and reviewed literature on the issue. They have examined the UD data that is available which is from 1972-1989 and since 2004. They note that the data in 1972-89 period was fairly consistent with A grades accounting for 30-35% of all grades. In the 2004 data, A grades account for over 40% of all grades. They are also looking at data about the change in average GPA in each unit over time. In addition to examining this data they will look at information on this year's graduating class who are the first cohort with +/- system throughout their four years. They also will be conducting a study to link grades to student evaluations of faculty.

International Strategy

Associate Provost Bickford reported that the International Strategy Team was formed in January of 2005 and charged to develop a comprehensive plan for internationalization that has the support of faculty, staff, students, and administrators and that the University is able to support. The Committee has given priority to three goals: Increasing the recruitment of international students, faculty, and post-docs; increasing the number of faculty and students who have a transformative educational experience abroad; and internationalizing the curriculum. Three working groups have been formed to focus on internationalizing the curriculum, recruitment, and education abroad. A draft plan should be complete to share with the Academic Senate in the Fall of 2006.

Post-Tenure Review

Senator Meyers reported that the Committee has been meeting for a year and has representation from all of the schools and the Academic Senate. The immediate need for the Committee is that there is a policy that requires a post-tenure review every six years. This policy has not been widely implemented. The Committee is looking at other institutions and identifying best practices. They have developed a document that has been reviewed by the Provost Council and that should be sent to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate by February 24, 2006. They would like to have a “sense of the Senate” discussion at the March meeting.

Teaching Loads, Workload, and Faculty Mix

Senator Biers reported that the background for this Committee includes the fact that there is no clear articulation of strategic rationale for use of faculty time by department or unit. In planning for future allocation of resources, the University needs explicit agreements for each department and unit’s faculty workload, including course and student loads. In addition tenure-track faculty need to be provided with clear expectations for tenure and promotion. The charge to the Committee is to review the workload policies developed at other universities; develop university-wide policy on faculty teaching loads and workload; oversee the development of Unit and Department guidelines and expectations for standards of teaching, research, and service; and to examine the mix of full- and part-time faculty. Senator Wells asked if the Committee anticipated a single, University-wide process or if the policy would allow for differences between disciplines and units. Senator Biers indicated that the Committee expected to develop a general framework that would then be used to further develop specific policies that recognize justified differences.

University-Wide Tenure and Promotion Policy

Senator Lasley reported that this Committee began as a very small group in the Fall of 2005. That group developed an initial draft document. The working group has now been expanded and has developed thirteen questions that need to be addressed. He is hopeful that there will be a draft for Senate review before the end of this semester. Senator Pestello noted that this Committee and the Committee considering post-tenure review were formed at the request of the Board of Trustees. The Board has the responsibility of approving each tenure and promotion decision. They would like to delegate this authority, and retain the authority to hear appeals. They want to be assured, before delegating this

authority, that there are consistent and rigorous standards across the College and the Schools.

Academic Identity

Senator O’Gorman reported for Associate Provost Skill. The charge of the Committee is to develop recommendations for how best to communicate what we do to a wide range of constituents. He used the example of the *Princeton Review*. While they note that UD has an alcohol issue, they also present UD in some very positive ways.

9. Adjournment: Moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Johnson
Secretary