

11-8-2010

2010-11-08 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, "2010-11-08 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2010). *ECAS Minutes*. Paper 214.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/214

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
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
November 8, 2010; 11 a.m.
St. Mary's Hall Room 113B

Present: Judith Huacuja, Bradley D Duncan, Andrea Seielstad, David Biers, Heidi G Gauder, Paul Benson, Joseph E Saliba, Leno M Pedrotti, Corinne Daprano, Rebecca Wells, Katie Trempe, Antonio Mari

Guests: James Farrelly, Adrienne Niess

Opening Meditation: Corinne Daprano opened the meeting with a meditation.

Minutes: The minutes of the November 1, 2010 meeting were postponed.

Announcements:

There will be a joint faculty/Senate meeting Friday, Nov. 12 at 3 p.m. in Boll Theater.

The Faculty Board and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate invite all members of the faculty to the forum "The Voice of the Faculty in University Governance: Silent or Silenced, Consulted or Ignored?" The forum will be held on November 16 in KU West Ballroom from 12:00-1:30 p.m.

Old Business: None.

New Business:

B. Duncan presented the Proposal on Revisions to the Composition of the Academic Senate. He reported that the committee's careful reading of the Senate Constitution put to rest issues of voting for the associate provost and dean of GPCE. Their conclusion is that the Constitution allows voting rights to extend to the position and that they could identify no meaningful reason for disenfranchising the graduate school. As a result, they determined that there was only a need to propose the minor language changes set out in the draft's Section 4 and 4.3.

Most of the subcommittee's discussion took place with respect to the dean of libraries position. The proposal is that the Dean of Libraries have a voting seat on Senate. The Deans of Students and Admissions were discussed but since neither supervise tenure track faculty nor do they have academic programs that they supervise, the committee proposed that they not have voting seats.

A variety of questions and concerns were raised in ECAS' discussion of the matter. Several members indicated that there is a need to add a faculty member to the Senate to counter the adding of an additional dean. The potential to tip the balance in actual voting as well as the

perception of concerns about faculty governance were cited as reasons in support of adding additional faculty voting members. Members reported that the last time the dean of library was proposed in the late 1990s, the faculty voted it down because of concerns that many faculty cast votes suggested by their deans and that adding another dean would mean adding more dean-driven votes. Some members suggested there should be an additional student vote as well.

The committee did not consider the issue of adding students or faculty because it was not part of their original charge. They had not reviewed a copy of the old proposal regarding the dean of libraries. However, B. Duncan reported that the committee discussion was heated at times, and there was an energetic and passionate agreement in favor of the dean of libraries having a voting seat. The summary statement accompanying the proposed recommendations reflects the final decision. The committee viewed the addition as creating an inconsequential change in the number and distribution of votes. Deans are faculty that also accept administrative roles. The arguments in favor of the proposal seem to trump any concerns about adding an extra administrator on senate. We need to make sure everyone knows that librarians here are faculty. There is serious concern about disenfranchisement of a dean that oversees a major academic program.

A discussion about possible ways of handling the proposal ensued. One option was to accept the proposal, as is, and refer it to the full senate for approval. Another was to have the committee explore the possibility of adding additional faculty and student member(s) to the Senate. A third was to parcel out and accept just the graduate school representative recommendation, and send the library dean issue back to the committee (or yet another committee) to determine what, if any, further recommendations might be made. On the other hand, the library dean issue could be resolved and put forward as a recommendation independent of any other considerations, and any further concerns about representation or the like could be taken up at a later time and date.

One member advocated for the inclusion of the deans of students and admissions as voting members as well, arguing that they were vital to UD's living/learning concept of learning that is part of our strategic plan. Arguments were made for and against adding additional faculty and some questioned the rationale for how the ratios were selected and whether we should consider redistricting representation across campus based upon the numbers in each department or other criteria.

Others discussed whether there was a constitutional crisis or not presented by the graduate school dean's appointment as Associate Provost. While the committee concluded that the Constitution already permitted such a role to be a voting member of the Senate, others argued that the structure of the Constitution and a vote to separate the Provost (who used to preside over the Senate) from the Senate did not, in fact permit persons holding positions with the Provost's Office to be voting members of the Senate. Comparisons were made with other Associate Provost positions (who do not currently have voting rights on the Senate). Some suggested that a meaningful distinction could be made between the Associate Provost

responsible for overseeing graduate programs and the Associate Provost positions held by Deb Bickford and Pat Donnelly. Whereas the graduate school appointment involved duties overseeing an academic program, the other provost positions did not. Members discussed whether this was a meaningful distinction or not.

The committee did not reach resolution by the end of the time allocated for the meeting. At the end of the discussion, J. Huacuja proposed three questions for resolution by ECAS:

- (1) Do we support this proposal as one and keep the separate components in the proposal as is?
- (2) Do we agree that committee should research and consider a possible 3rd and 4th component of proposal (faculty and student representation).
- (3) Do we add a student representative to Brad's committee and do we add adjunct faculty representation to Brad's committee, if the matter is sent back for further deliberation?

A motion on question (1) was made by J. Huacuja and seconded by C. Daprano. Specifically, the motion was to refer the document to the Academic Senate as is, a single proposal with the two components in it . The motion failed with 2 in favor and 8 against it.

In the next meeting, ECAS will decide what direction to go next. J. Huacuja invited suggestions by Thursday, Noveber 11, 2010.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15.

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Seielstad