

Faculty Senate
April 4, 2013
Collins Center
3:00pm-5:00pm

Present: Hawley Almstedt, Sean D'Evelyn, Elizabeth Drummond, Richard Fox, Paul Harris, George Hess, Charles Hillen, Diane Meyer, Mladen Milicevic, , Judy Park, John Parrish, Jennifer Pate, Ralph Quinones, Robert Rovetti, Gregory Ruzzin, Marta Sanchez, Sue Scheibler, Tim Shanahan, Carl Urbinati, Thomas White and Amy Woodson-Boulton.

Excused: Laurel Burks, Michele Hammers, Karen Huchting, Omar Es-Said, Katherine Noon , and Patricia Oliver

Moment of Silence

Motion 1: Move to approve the March 21, 2013 minutes as amended.

11 for, 0 against, 3 abstentions

By unanimous consent the agenda was adjusted to allow for the Honor Code presentation by Prof. Wendy Binder.

Honor Code

Presenter Wendy Binder, Associate Professor of Biology and Chair of the Committee on Excellence in Teaching (CCET)

- We believe this whole process needs to be redone as many students and faculty are not aware of the current honor code. A recent CTE expert speaker believed LMU does not truly have a honor code, as what is in place does not have input from students and does not create a standard and link to the university's mission. The committee looked at other institutions' honor codes and worked to create a new policy. We are at the beginning of this process and have thus far written a better version of the honor code and a pledge. We feel that student orientation could be a time to read and sign the document. This could be a good venue to formally introduce students to LMU's academic honesty policy.
- The new honor code has three parts: the definitions; violations; and processes and procedures. The new policy works to get rid of the category of "unintended violations" and outlines a clear manner in which to handle academic dishonestly. Currently LMU faculty members decide themselves whether to report violations and reporting does not always get properly communicated. LMU needs to implement a clearer policy to avoid legal technicalities and personal liabilities.
- A student admitting to dishonesty and challenging a violation are two very different scenarios. Faculty may choose to fail the assignment or fail the course grade. This creates a grey area and faculty are currently personally liable and can become involved in law suits.

Discussion

- I suggest minimizing the number of appeals by perhaps removing one level at the Department Chair level.
- At some institutions all decisions are made by the Dean after a faculty member submits the evidence. This could lead to more regularization in the process, but may take the decision out of the faculty member's hands.
- If a violation occurs at the end of the semester, currently the student's grade would be put on hold if there is not enough time for review by the academic honesty panel.
- I'm concerned about a system of checks and balances and determining if the faculty could appeal the Dean's decision.
- I'm interested in looking at the front end and avoiding dishonestly. I feel the issue of taking a pledge may not be effective for those who are dishonest.
- I suggest a deliberate first year seminar topic that addresses academic honesty. This may fit well into the new core curriculum.
- I believe connecting to the Registrar's Offices and having students read the document in PROWL may be another effective way to ensure everyone reads the policy.
- Students need a clear explanation of what constitutes academic dishonesty. The issue of turning in the same paper in two courses particularly needs to be addressed. I suggest this happens at orientation and as part of the freshman seminar to ensure it is constantly reinforced.
- Are students required to report if they know others are being dishonest?
-No, not currently but this could be included. Students are often more harsh when rendering judgment on the academic honesty panel. The current panel however lacks transparency and needs to be populated by more students. This panel could then have the final say on a case and determine any penalties. It is important to articulate timeline issues to ensure it is a quick process.
- Any final student appeal could be to the President if he would like to be involved as the final arbiter.
- There is a question whether the new process would look at prior dishonestly. Record keeping is critical and repeat offenders need to be tracked better. Tracking course failure due to academic dishonesty could be indicated internally or externally on the student's transcript.

- We need to clarify what happens when a student admits and does not admit academic dishonesty. Perhaps a form could be developed and utilized to track this.
- I believe having the Dean receive all cases may take the burden off of the faculty member. The right for faculty member to appeal a Dean's decision may make this process work well for faculty.
- We may want to put more focus on preventative measures. The current language such as confession may create the sense of a criminal type process.
- The issue of prevention is critical and students must know this topic is important. When first time offenders are given a pass and not reported, this may create liability for the faculty member. The idea of a "traffic school" was suggested to deal with individual offenders, formalize this issue and correct the problem.
- The role of Associate Deans may be critical as these types of issues are generally a part of their responsibilities.
- Writing a letter for the student's file could create a record and allow for better record keeping.

Faculty Handbook and Academic Life Committee Report

Jennifer Pate, Chair of the Faculty Handbook and Academic Life Committee

- The Faculty Handbook and Academic Life Committee has identified areas for revision for the Faculty Handbook. Currently the primary goal is to reduce the amount of misinformation and superfluous information. The committee is approaching the revision in three categories, two of which are presented today. (See Appendix A). Category one are updates for the April 2013 revised edition of the handbook. Further changes may require additional discussion and in some cases a full faculty vote.

Motion 2: Move to adopt the four changes presented in category one.

18 for, 0 against, 1 abstention

Discussion

- The Faculty Resource Guide provides information on campus life and we should refer to the guide in the addenda. A flow chart of the structure of the university would be useful and we should be building in the Faculty Senate and Committees where appropriate.
- Faculty contracts reference the Faculty Handbook and the handbook is an extension of faculty contracts. It should be clear it goes both ways and the handbook should reference the contract.
- By unanimous consent the section titled institutional objectives was amended to be retitled Preamble.

Motion 3: Move to approve points 1-3 in category 2 as amended.

18 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions

Discussion and Q&A with the Provost

Presenter: Joseph B. Hellige, Executive Vice President and Provost

- The process of implementing a new core has required a lot of dedication by the faculty and I'm grateful for all of the work. We are looking at a 2-3 year implementation process. There is a need for a faculty member who would provide coordination of all aspects of the new core. This individual would be the point person to work with Dean's Offices and ensure that the core is viable for the students. The position would report to the Provost and serve as a champion for the core. The Provost believes the faculty are the owners of the curricular content of the core.
- My sense is that because of the complexities of implementation it is risky to have a new core without a creating this type of position. The new core cuts across all colleges and we need someone who knows all the specifics and what works for students. Ensuring all first year students have appropriate sections available is just one part of the job that is critical. Students must have a clear path and enough sections offered to satisfy their core curriculum requirements.
- This position would also coordinate with the UCCC and know the inner workings of ongoing implementation. The curricular discussions need to be framed by resource constraints, and classroom availability among other issues. Shared governance is critical to make this work.

Discussion

- There has not been anyone directing from above and that is a good thing. I feel the creation process has created a better bottom up process we should keep following. I would suggest a couple of changes to the wording of the position. Historically a director position brings a vision and I'm not sure this is what we should be striving for in this case. I suggest the title be changed to something like Administrative Coordinator of the core.
- I propose we add to the duties section that the individual develops administrative policies in collaboration with the UCCC and consultation with the Faculty Senate.
- I would like to clarify how we define what the role of this position is in relation to the UCCC. I believe the message that anyone can teach any course in the core is a bit off and departments will continue to have a large role in managing course offerings in specific areas in the core.
- I read the job description language as a more expansive and powerful position. The language of ongoing development of LMU's core speaks to the curricular side. I believe the description should be downgraded to a mid-level staff position and it should be clearer where it resides relative to the UCCC and the Faculty Senate.

- I feel this position working to develop courses goes too far and the curriculum should remain with the faculty.
- I agree a point person is needed, but there is a legitimate concern this position could evolve. I suggest the number of course remissions be limited to keep the individual teaching and in the department.
- It is clear there needs to be additional work completed. Rhetorical Arts is unfinished, and integrations courses are scarce. There are implementation challenges to be addressed, but this should be a short term position and not expand.
- I feel that culture always wins and LMU historically has had challenges with expanding administrative roles. This position should be justified and evaluated to determine if it should continue.
- Putting in writing the administration of the core will be reviewed on an annual basis by the Provost, UCCC and Faculty Senate would potentially help. The process of finding and advocating for resources is another huge piece of this role.
- Once implementation is complete the role should shrink. The special assistant to the Provost role may be more appropriate and temporary. The chair of UCCC with staff support could potentially fill this role. We also need to have a broader discussion of how core governance will work.
- Resources will be made available to the extent that they do not exceed that of the current core.
- Solidifying a term limit and putting in more language to highlight the principally administrative nature of the role would be useful. The term “Administrative Director of the Core” might help us attract more accomplished faculty to apply for the position. How the position is appointed is important as there is no search process for the special assistant role.
- I believe the leadership needed for implementation should utilize elected faculty members of the UCCC which could help give more respect to standing committees. We ideally want all faculty to be responsible for the core and not a director. We should use existing structures to the extent possible to forward implementation.

Adjourned at 5:00pm

Submitted by: Jennifer Pate

Prepared by: Robert Houghtaling

Appendix A

Faculty Handbook and Academic Life Committee Recommendations (4/2/13)

Based on the Guiding Principles for Conducting an Audit of the Faculty Handbook as approved by the Faculty Senate on October 18, 2012, the FHALC makes the following recommendations accordingly.

Category 1:

1. Change the language in the Faculty Handbook (hereafter FH) to improve its accuracy.
 - a. Update “Chief Academic Officer” to say “Provost” throughout.
 - b. In the Table of Contents, change II to say “Procedures for Amending the Faculty Handbook”
2. We recommend that both the Faculty Handbook and Handbook Addenda be numbered consecutively, starting from 1, 2, ... in the FH (as currently done) and starting again with 1, 2, ... in the Addenda.
3. We recommend relocating sections I.A. and I.B. (on pages 1 – 3) to Section O, “Specific Faculty Responsibilities,” to become sections O.7. and O.8.
4. Section R.13. “Identification Cards” should be amended to say, “Identification Cards are issued by the University to all faculty.

Category 2:

1. We recommend deleting the Appendix. More specifically, delete Appendix I under VI. Appendices (in the Handbook Addenda on page VI, 1).
2. Remove the current Acknowledgment (Page i), Preamble (Page ii), and History (Pages iii-vi) and replace with Handbook Addenda Section I.A. titled, “Institutional Objectives.”
 - a. Update FH Section III, “Procedures for Amending the Faculty Handbook Addenda” to remove references to the acknowledgements, preamble, and history.
3. Add a reference in the beginning of the Handbook Addenda to the Faculty Resource Guide (compiled annually by the Office of Faculty Affairs) as the official informational appendix to the FH.
4. Revise Section II of the FH, “Procedures for Amending the Faculty Handbook,” to read:

Proposed amendments, originated by individual faculty members or by any group of faculty, should be forwarded to the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Senate will review and modify the proposal, preparatory to submitting the proposed amendment to the faculty at large.

Following faculty discussion, faculty vote, and approval, the Faculty Senate will forward the proposal to the Chief Academic Officer/Provost.

The Faculty Senate, in consultation with the Chief Academic Officer/Provost, will prepare the final draft of the Faculty Senate Handbook with the to forward the proposed amendment to forward to the President for consideration and approval. Upon approval, the modification becomes effective.

It should be noted that, if at any point in this procedure, the proposed amendment is substantively revised, it must be returned to the Faculty Senate for discussion and approval.

In some matters, as in those parts of the Handbook which have been made University Statutes, Trustee approval of amendments is required. Further, the Trustees have the right to make amendments to the Handbook on their own initiative, although this rarely is done, and then only after consultation with the faculty.

All modifications of the Handbook, upon approval, shall be promulgated to all holders of the Handbook. An authoritative edition of the Faculty Handbook will be published once a year on the second Wednesday of July. Authoritative copies of the handbook will be distributed to the university community. One authoritative paper bound copy will be placed in the University Department of Archives and Special Collections.

5. Remove and/or replace all components of the Handbook Addenda that are out of date. [The following recommendations assume that the Handbook Addenda begins with an explicit reference to the Faculty Resource Guide for this information.]
 - a. Remove Section I.B. "Structure of the University" and incorrect organizational chart on page I, 3.
 - b. Remove Section II, "Government of the University," which is done more accurately and will be updated more frequently in the Faculty Resource Guide.
 - c. Revise Section III, "Academic Officers," removing section III.A. through III.J. (Leaving Section III.K. intact.)
 - d. Ask the Committee on Committees to review Section IV, "Committees of the University" and bring updates/revisions to the Faculty Senate for approval.
 - e. Reduce Section V, "Administrative Procedures Governing the University" to refer to the appropriate sections of the Faculty Resource Guide, the University Bulletin, and/or Human Resources for the most up-to-date information.
 - i. Subsequently remove pages V, 10 – V, 64.