University of Dayton
eCommons

12-2-2011

2011-12-02 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, " 2011-12-02 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2011). *Academic Senate Minutes.* Paper 28.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/28

Approved
Minutes of Academic Senate
Friday, December 2; 3:00 p.m.
KU West Ballroom

Present: Jim Dunne, Rebecca Wells, Linda Hartley, George Doyle, Carissa Krane, Megan Abbate, Jesse Grewal, Emily Kaylor, Dimitri Tsiribas, Heather Parsons, Nick Michel, John McCombe, Shelia Hassell Hughes, Art Jipson, Jonathan Hess, Emily Hicks, Kathleen Webb, Philip Anloague, Vinod Jain, Paul Vanderburgh, Kim Trick, Laura Leming, Carolyn Phelps, Kevin Kelly, David Johnson, Andrea Seielstad, Corinne Daprano

Guests: Jim Farrelly, Deb Bickford, Patrick Donnelly, Bill Fisher, Dave Dolph

Absent: Paul Benson, Leno Pedrotti, Antonio Mari, Caroline Merithew, Terence Lau, Joseph Radisek, Kaitlin Regan, Partha Banerjee, Tony Saliba, Joe Castellano, John White, Joseph Saliba, Paul McGreal

Opening Meditation: Linda Hartley opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: Minutes of the October 14, 2011 meeting were approved

Announcements:
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).

J. Hess announced that the Senate may need to add an additional meeting to the spring semester schedule. If so, the Senate will meet from 3-5 p.m. on Friday, April 27 in the west Ballroom. He asked that all senators hold that time on their calendars until we get closer to that date.

Committee Reports:
Academic Policies Committee. C. Phelps reported that the APC met on Oct. 24 to discuss the MPAP program proposal by the SOEAP. Kevin Kelly, Dean of the SOEAP presented the PA program proposal to the APC. After K. Kelly's presentation members of the APC raised several questions/concerns regarding details of the program. The APC then voted to recommend acceptance of the program.

At their Nov. 21 meeting the APC discussed the Program Development Process (PDP). Final changes and edits were reviewed. The proposal was approved and will be presented at the ASenate Jan. 20 meeting. Additionally, at that meeting Brad Duncan Associate Dean of Graduate, Professional, and Continuing Education presented three proposals to the APC: Graduate Retake Policy; Guidelines for the Development of Bachelor's Plus Master's (BPM) Degree Programs; Graduate Academic Standards and Progress Policy. The APC decided that the retake and BPM Degree Program proposals would be revised and re-submitted to the APC for review. The Progress policy was tabled so that further consultation with faculty in SOEAP could take place.

Student Academic Policies Committee. G. Doyle reported that the SAPC met Oct. 26 to revise the Academic Honor Code. At that meeting it was decided that: 1) the honor code will apply to all UD students, except law school students; 2) students will not be asked to sign the pledge; and 3) SAPC does not believe that students are made aware of Honor Code after application, but before matriculation, so that statement was removed from the Honor Code. He also indicated that the revised Honor Code had been sent to the Provost's Office, Legal Affairs, and the Deans for review.

Several members of the Senate raised questions about the practice of signing the Honor Code. It was suggested that further consultation regarding the proposed changes be made by the SAPC. Bill Fisher,

VP Student Development clarified that undergraduate students do not sign the Honor Code during orientation; they do recite the honor pledge during the convocation. He suggested that there may be an opportunity to have students' sign the pledge during orientation. G. Doyle agreed to consult further with Student Development and the Deans.

Faculty Affairs Committee. L. Hartley reported that the FAC has met several times since the Oct. Senate meeting. FAC is working on the following: 1) Faculty and Instructional Staff/Title Revision proposal ; 2) Intellectual Property Policy; 3) further revisions to the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET); and, 4) faculty workload issue. Further, the Faculty Workload sub-committee will report to the FACAS at its January 19th meeting their recommendations congruent with the charge and established timetable.

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. J. Hess reported that ECAS has created a Senate Composition Committee that is being chaired by Carl Fries (BIO) to implement the recommendations in Senate DOCI-1101.

J. Hess also reported that ECAS is working with President Curran and Provost Saliba to resolve concerns regarding consultation and shared governance issues. He asked for input from the Senate on the consultation issue and indicated that ECAS has decided to frame their discussions with the President and Provost around the recent creation this past summer semester of two new Vice President positions.

Additionally, J. Hess asked that when preparing Senate documents for review by ECAS and the Senate, units, committees, and individuals try to consult as widely as possible with those units that are most impacted by a particular proposal.

New Business:
Masters of Physician Assistant Program (MPAP) Proposal. Kevin Kelly, SOEAP Dean, presented the MPAP proposal to the Senate (Senate DOC I-11-03). After presenting the proposal to the Senate K. Kelly asked for comments and questions from the Senate. A great deal of questions and discussion followed.

C. Krane asked about the involvement of existing departments and faculty in teaching courses for the MPAP or whether the MPAP program faculty would deliver the entire curriculum. K. Kelly responded that the staffing pattern in the proposal called for newly hired MPAP faculty to deliver the curriculum but that it would be useful to look at potential collaborations with other departments/units across campus. P. Analogue asked if there had been discussions with the GDHA (Greater Dayton Hospital Association) regarding the proposal. K. Kelly responded that the Association was aware and supportive of the SOEAP proposal.

K. Trick asked what rank would be given to the newly hired MPAP program faculty. K. Kelly responded that they would be given the rank of clinical faculty. A. Seielstad asked if it would be problematic to hire program faculty given that most PA graduates have master's degrees and only one to two years of clinical experience. K. Kelly responded that the hiring of MPAP program faculty would be similar to hiring an assistant professor who had newly graduated from a doctoral program. P. Vanderburgh indicated that he felt UD could be competitive in terms of hiring MPAP faculty members.

R. Wells asked whether MPAP students would be given any tuition discount. P. Vanderburgh responded that there were no provisions in the proposal to give these graduate students a tuition discount. R. Wells then asked if the creation of the MPAP program would result in the re-allocation of existing university resources. K. Kelly indicated that the Board of Trustees has allocated money specifically for this program. R. Wells asked if there was a risk that the MPAP program would not come to fruition. K. Kelly responded that he viewed the risk as an internal risk and added that there is an element of risk in everything.

K. Trick asked how comparable UD's MPAP tuition rate would be to the other universities that have or intend to create MPAP programs. K. Kelly responded that UD's tuition rate would be higher than Ohio State's rate but competitive with most of the other schools in Ohio that are offering or plan to offer a

MPAP program.

K. Kelly then made a motion to approve the establishment of a MPAP program at UD. The motion was seconded by A. Jipson.

R. Wells asked for clarification as to what an affirmative vote on the motion would mean in terms of the proposal approval process. J. Farrelly raised the issue of whether or not the entire proposal would need to be presented to the Senate again for approval since the current document (Senate DOC I-11-04) does not contain the proposed program curriculum. S. Hughes pointed out that the timeline included in the current MPAP proposal does not include a timeframe for returning the proposal to the Senate once a curriculum has been proposed. She added that what the Senate was being asked to approve was actually the creation of a new department that would have the ability to hire program faculty to create the program curriculum. She disagreed with J. Farrelly that the entire proposal would need to come back to the Senate for approval. Instead the MPAP proposed program curriculum would need to be reviewed and approved by the Senate. C. Daprano asked whether a similar process of program curriculum review and approval would need to take place at the unit level before the proposal was submitted to the Senate. J. Hess agreed that this process would need to take place at the unit level prior to the curriculum proposal being presented to the Senate.

K. Kelly then suggested changing the title of Senate DOC I-11-03 to: "Proposal to establish a department of Physician Assistant Education for the purpose of developing the Master of Physician Assistant Practice (MPAP)". Amending the title in this way would more accurately reflect the content of the proposal.

Further discussion/questions arose following this proposed change. A. Seielstad questioned the MPAP program fit with the university. K. Kelly responded that the MPAP program was a good fit for UD and that the program was not so vastly different from other HSS programs. S. Hughes asked if there were concerns about creating a new department that would be staffed by non-tenure track faculty. K. Kelly responded that he would eventually like to have a mix of clinical and tenure track faculty who would staff the department.

J. Farrelly asked again for clarification of what the Senate was voting on when voting for approval of Senate DOC I-11-03. J. Hess responded that a "Yes" vote would give the SOEAP the approval to establish a department, allocate space for the department, and hire MPAP program faculty but not to approve the MPAP program curriculum. Alternatively, a "No" vote would indicate that the Senate would not support the establishment of a MPAP department as currently proposed in Senate DOC I-11-03.

K. Kelly then amended his previous motion. His motion was to approve Senate DOC I-11-03 and change its title to: "Proposal to establish a department of PA Education for the purpose of developing the Master of Physician Assistant Practice." He also added the following to the proposal's cover sheet.: "**NOTE:** Because the proposal involves the establishment of a department of Physician Assistant Education the master's program curriculum will be submitted to the Academic Senate for review and approval".

Senate DOC I-11-03 "Proposal to establish a Department of Physician Assistant Education for the purpose of developing the Master of Physician Assistant Practice" was approved by a vote of 23 approved; 1 opposed; 3 abstain.

J. Hess announced that the remaining items on the Senate's agenda would be tabled till the Senate meeting in January given the lengthy discussion of the MPAP proposal.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano