

1-24-2005

2005-01-24 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

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

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "2005-01-24 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2005). *ECAS Minutes*. Paper 82.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/82

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

APPROVED

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

January 24, 2005 – 3:00 – 4:00 p.m. in St. Mary's 113B

PRESIDING: David Biers

SENATORS PRESENT: Biddle, Biers, Buchino, Eloe, Huelsman, Penno, Pestello, Rapp, Saliba, Webb, Yungblut

1. Opening Prayer: D. Biers said a prayer.
2. Roll Call: Everyone gave self introductions.
3. Approval of ECAS Minutes for November 18, 2004: The November 18, 2004 minutes were approved as written.
4. Announcements:
 - a. F. Pestello reminded everyone that there is a Faculty meeting on Friday, January 28 at 3:00 to discuss the FY06 budget which was approved by the Board of Trustees. The tuition increase will be discussed at the meeting.
 - b. Bill Massy is coming in on February 22 and will put the final Vision together. He will meet with the Provost's Council, the President's Council and the ECAS. The ECAS meeting will be held from 2:00-3:00. This body will represent the faculty as the vision is being finalized. All the Vision minutes from previous meetings will be sent to Bill Massy. F. Pestello said he also put together a group of faculty members to look at all the notes from all of the meetings that were held. They were asked to come up with about six key points in response to the current Vision document, trying to determine from all the comments received, what they see are the critical issues. This information will be shared with the ECAS and also with B. Massy.
5. Old Business:
 - o Standing Committee Reports:
 - Academic Policies Committee (APC)*: D. Biers stated that the APC will continue working on clusters. They are sending four questions that were in the original document to the chairs and deans for response. It was reiterated that Dean Morton does want clusters evaluated. D. Biers asked the ECAS if it would be beneficial for Corinne Daprano and Paul Benson to give a report at a future meeting, and the group agreed.
 - Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)*: L. Yungblut said their first committee meeting will be on Wednesday, January 26. Their committee will be working on two issues: 1) an evaluation of tenured faculty as pertaining to student evaluations of teaching; and 2) the relationship between grade inflation and academic excellence.
 - Student Academic Policies Committee (SAPC)*: N. Buchino said the Honor Code has been drafted. After it has been edited, she will bring it to

the ECAS. F. Pestello requested that N. Buchino get Student Development involved and work with the Provost's office and to contact Kathleen Henderson for assistance. N. Buchino stated that the committee did meet with Dr. Schuerman but the student academic senators need to review the document. She will give them a deadline.

N. Buchino stated that Dale Courte said a colleague of his had an issue regarding the academic calendar. There is one date listed on the calendar each semester as the last day to change grades. Problems occur when some students, unhappy with their grade, become stressed when they see that date on the calendar and bother the faculty member about wanting to review their work, exams, etc., before that date. This colleague's feeling is that the mention of such a date on the calendar does not promote academic excellence because it creates an impression that grade changes are normal and that grades can be negotiated after the fact. Even though grade changes are rare occurrences, this colleague feels that it would be appropriate not to note such a day on the academic calendar but to make faculty alone aware of it by some other means. It was mentioned that there is a good reason to keep it there. If a student wants a review or has an incomplete, they can be made aware of the time remaining to improve their grade. The ECAS agreed that they do not see a need for change, and D. Biers will respond to Dale Courte with the decision of the committee.

6. New Business:

- *Consideration of Provost's Council agenda* – D. Biers distributed a copy of the Provost Council critical issues for Winter, Spring and Summer 2005 to the ECAS. F. Pestello said that it was a draft copy to be modified and asked the committee not to share it with anyone. He said a final copy will be given to D. Biers. The final copy can be shared. The Senate will then be asked to consider these issues. A comment was made that several of the items under the "form subcommittees category" are already being considered by their dean, and the Provost Council is considering at a higher level. The concerns are: 1) the need to ensure faculty involvement; and 2) how can it all be coordinated? The Senate needs to be involved. F. Pestello stated that the Provost's Council becomes a critical body at which efforts are coordinated and that is where he is working with the Council which includes the President of the Senate to set the agenda. Then the Senate needs to take the finalized list and determine how they will be involved, i.e., represented on relevant subcommittees. If changes are to be made to tenure and promotion, it has to be approved by a vote of the faculty if structural changes are made. As F. Pestello works with the deans of each unit, they are expected to work with their faculty on each of these issues. Grade inflation will be more closely monitored and will be tracked. The Provost's Council is the body where items are coordinated and there will be an explicit list of what is being considered that can be shared with people. The ECAS is the conduit to the Academic Senate on this and talk about how the Senate will engage in discussions. F. Pestello stated that he is in the process of identifying who will be put in charge of leading each item and it will be a member

of the Provost's Council. That person is expected to add faculty or staff members that are deemed appropriate to start to work on these issues together. They may or may not be senators. D. Biers will be expected to update the ECAS about what is going on in the Provost's Council and vice versa, what is going on in the ECAS. F. Pestello stated that there will be faculty representation on the committees. F. Pestello said some items will be done within units and some of it will be valuable to do across units. The workload policy is an intra-unit discussion. Tenure and promotion discussion will be across units. F. Pestello stated that the Board of Trustees felt they should not be the final voice on tenure and promotion. At this point, every tenure and promotion case goes to the Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee. Every case is reviewed and they vote. The Board feels it does not have the expertise to make those decisions. On the other hand, they are not comfortable taking themselves out of the process, given our current structure on tenure and promotion. They want a university wide review, but they do not want it on their level. They want a university wide review on the Provost's level. Once this is put into place, they will take themselves out of it. They will remain the body of appeal on procedural issues. If a faculty member is denied by the President, they will hear an appeal on process.

It was suggested for each subcommittee chair to talk to their committee and determine what they think important issues are that the senate should be examining. D. Biers said he would send something to the entire university and ask what issues they want to be considered.

- *Evaluation of the Stander Symposium* – D. Biers stated that some people have brought concerns to his attention about the Stander Symposium, particularly, in regard to assessments and lack of planning. J. Rapp stated that he is on the committee representing the senate and will talk to S. Dandaneau. D. Biers said he will ask Steve to attend an ECAS meeting to discuss this.
- *Constitution of the Senate* – It came out during the elections that the student representative to ECAS is the SGA's vice president of academic affairs and that person would serve ex officio. That is not what the constitution states. In addition, the period that this person is appointed does not coincide with what the current practice is in starting up a new senate. This needs to be referred to Faculty Affairs.

Another issue is that one point in time the senate began its new year in the beginning of the academic year, but at some point it was switched to the middle of the school year. It was felt that the change was made in relation to the budget cycle. You lose continuity and momentum in terms of the action items that are being worked on when you get a new set of senators. D. Biers suggested that the elections take place late spring and they will serve the next year. F. Pestello stated that he could not think of a reason not to change it back. This will be referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

- *Compensation* – This relates to faculty on a nine month appointment when they decide to teach and their teaching goes across the fiscal year or a person works on a research contract during the summer. Administrators get their salary increase as of July 1 where somebody in research contract works at their old salary rate until August 16. Someone that teaches during the summer over that period of time teaches at their old salary rate. It was stated that faculty contract starts in August and ends in May. Since this issue does not affect the faculty on a broad level, it was decided that it is not an issue for the senate. D. Biers will respond to Pat Sweeney since this came out of his area.
- *OhioLINK message from Fred Jenkins* – D. asked the ECAS if they want to do something as a senate to support this as it relates to funding cuts. It was stated that the State treated OhioLINK pretty well and it is a model in the country. Our library was in it early, and it saves us tremendous amounts of money and we would never be able to get all the resources that we can get collectively because OhioLINK leverages the entire State. F. Jenkins and his colleagues are encouraging you to contact these people. There is some belief that it could make a difference. There is a need to make faculty understand that a state budget cut to OhioLINK does affect the library's ability to provide the resources the faculty have come to expect. D. Biers asked if it would be helpful to write a letter on behalf of the senate and send it to Columbus representatives, and it was agreed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Judy Wilson