

Approved
Minutes of Academic Senate
Friday, October 14; 3:00 p.m.
KU West Ballroom

Present: Andrea Seielstad, Jonathan Hess, Antonio Mari, Jesse Grewal, George Doyle, Jim Dunne, Joseph Radisek, Heather Parsons, Carissa Krane, John McCombe, Caroline Merithew, Carolyn Phelps, Rebecca Wells, Leno Pedrotti, Laura Leming, Emily Hicks, Paul McGreal, Philip Anloague, Kevin Kelly, Terence Lau, Megan Abbate, Emily Kaylor, Kaitlin Regan, Linda Hartley, John White, Joseph Saliba, Corinne Daprano

Guests: Jim Farrelly, Amy Gullen, Shannon Miller, Deb Bickford, Katie Kinnucan-Welsch, Brad Duncan, Patrick Donnelly

Absent: David Johnson, Shelia Hughes, Paul Benson, Vinod Jain, Art Jipson, Paul Vanderburgh, Tony Saliba, Kathleen Webb, Kim Trick, Partha Banerjee, Joseph Castellano

Opening Meditation: Antonio Mari opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: Minutes of the September 16, 2011 meeting were approved

Announcements:

J. Hess announced that the next meeting of the Academic Senate is November 11, 3:00-5:00pm, KU Boll Theater. This is the annual joint Senate-Faculty meeting

J. Hess announced that the January meeting of the Senate will be moved back a week from its originally scheduled date. The Senate will now meet from 3:00-5:00 p.m. on Friday, January 20, 2012 in the auditorium (room S1050) on River campus (1700 Patterson Blvd).

Kevin Kelly, SOEAP Dean, announced that the MPA program proposal has been approved by the SOEAP faculty and also by the GLC. It is expected that the first entering class will be enrolled in the 2014-15 AY.

J. Farrelly, chair of the Faculty Board (FB), announced that the FB will work with the Senate and Office of the Provost to co-sponsor a luncheon regarding faculty workload. The luncheon will take place in Nov.

Old Business:

Committee Reports.

Academic Policies Committee. C. Phelps reported that the APC met on Sept. 26 and went point by point through the *Undergraduate Degree Program Development Plan (PDP) document* comparison table developed last spring by J. Hess in order to reconcile the PDP and Senate DOC 94-10. Changes will be made to the PDP, now titled the Undergraduate Degree Proposal Process. Changes will be reviewed and approval for the document will be addressed at the next meeting of the APC. The next meeting of the APC is on Oct. 24 from 2-4 PM in KU 207.

Student Academic Policies Committee. G. Doyle reported that the SAPC met on Sept. 28 and the following decisions were made regarding the Academic Dishonesty Report form: 1) change the title of the form to "Academic Incident Report"; 2) include the date of the incident on the form; 3) include each of the seven areas of dishonesty cited in the Academic Honor Code on the form; 4) include a space for Appeal to the Chair; 5) include a space for Appeal to the Department Review Committee; 6) include a space for Appeal to the Dean's Office; 7) include a space for Appeal to the Provosts Office; and, 8) eliminate the paragraph that details the appeal process and refer the student to the honor code, section V. The Academic Incident Report form was sent to ECAS for review.

L. Leming asked if a department chair would receive notice that a faculty member in their department had initiated an Academic Incident Report. L. Pedrotti reported that the APC and SAPC were working on a paragraph description of the reporting process.

R. Wells asked if there was consideration of how to centralize the location of the incident reports once they were completed. G. Doyle indicated that centralization was not appropriate given the current honor code policy.

J. Farrelly clarified that the Academic Incident Report would not need Senate approval but the reporting process paragraph would since it will be appended to the incident report.

R. Wells asked about electronic storage of the incident report. A. Mari indicated that electronic storage of these incident reports would be problematic in terms of limiting access to the reports and that the SAPC wanted a paper trail that would end in the student's Dean's office.

J. Hess encouraged senators to talk to C. Phelps or G. Doyle with further concerns/input regarding the Academic Incident Report form. The next meeting of the SAPC is on Oct. 26 at 10 AM in KL 205.

Faculty Affairs Committee. L. Hartley reported that the FAC had met on Oct. 11 and discussed the following: 1) an update from the FAC workload ad hoc committee; 2) Intellectual Property Policy progress report; 3) Student Observation of Faculty Teaching revisions; and, 4) the Faculty and Instructional Staff/Title Revision proposal. L. Hartley indicated that the Senate proposal (SOFT) was given to ECAS on September 28. After reviewing the proposal ECAS suggested several revisions to the proposal. The FAC discussed these suggestions in order to revise the document, and resubmit to ECAS. The next meeting of the FAC is on Oct. 25 from 3-4:30 PM in KU 207.

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. J. Hess reported that ECAS has been working on the following issues: 1) review of several GPCE documents and the SET proposal; 2) consultation issues and shared governance; 3) creation of a Senate Composition Committee to implement the recommendation in Senate DOC1-1101 to *"...consider the proportional representation of faculty, students, and administrators at the University of Dayton, and strive to articulate ideal ratios for representation of faculty, students and administrators"*; 4) November Faculty/Senate meeting agenda items; and, 5) possible items for inclusion on the December Senate meeting agenda.

J. Saliba asked what questions have arisen regarding the GPCE documents. J. Hess indicated that ECAS raised questions regarding whether or not adequate consultation with graduate faculty had taken place prior to GLC approval of the GPCE documents. J. Saliba suggested that ECAS and the Senate could determine if additional consultation was needed once they have had a chance to review the documents. J. Farrelly added that the Senate has the option of designating that a proposal needs legislative concurrence or legislative authority.

J. Saliba asked whether it was justifiable to share information regarding academic dishonesty back and forth between Student Development and the academic units. T. Lau suggested that it was possible to do so by allowing record keeping to be done by Student Development, since they already have a reporting process in place, and having the faculty along with their respective Dean's office be responsible for adjudicating the process.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano