

2-15-2012

2012-02-15 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, "2012-02-15 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2012). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 85.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/85

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

Approved
Minutes of Academic Senate
Friday, February 15, 2013; 3:00 p.m.
KU West Ballroom

Present: Paul Benson, Caroline Merithew, Sheila Hughes, Linda Hartley, John McCombe, Kurt Mosser, Dominic Sanfilippo, Leno Pedrotti, Carissa Krane, Andrew Ewvaraye, Arthur Jipson, Laura Leming, Carolyn Phelps, Paul Bobrowski, Janet Greenlee, James Dunne, Ralph Frasca, Hussein Saleh, Kevin Kelly, Corinne Daprano, Phil Anloague, John White, Ruth Monnier, Tony Saliba, Vinod Jain, Monish Chatterjee, George Doyle, Henry Gerla, Robyn Bradford, Kathy Webb, Emily Hicks, Donald Shimmin, Karen Swisher, Allie Michel, Joseph Saliba

Guests: Mark Nielsen, Ryan McEwan, Mary Kay Kelly, Kim Lally, Jim McCutcheon, Patricia Polanski, Alan Demmitt, Molly Schaller, M. Brent Kondritz, Paul Piechota, Phil Farais, Joe Mashburn, Janet Herrelko, David Wright, Patrick Reynolds, James Hiller, Sharon Gratto, Kathy Harmon, Joyce Carter, Beth Schwartz, Susan Wulff, John Rowe, Jayne Robinson, Patrick Donnelly, Katie Kinnucan-Welsch, Paul Vanderburgh,

Absent: Anthony Whaley, Sarah Kerns, Jarred White, Paul McGreal

Opening Meditation: Sheila Hughes opened the meeting with a meditation.

Minutes: Minutes of the December 14, 2012 meeting were approved.

Announcements:

The next meeting of the Academic Senate is March 15, 2013, 3:00-5:00 p.m. in KU Ballroom.

C. Phelps welcomed Leadership UD guests, Brent Kondritz and Kim Lally to the ASenate meeting.

C. Phelps announced that Monish Chatterjee (ENGR) was replacing Partha Banerjee as one of the SOE's representatives to the ASenate.

Committee Reports:

Academic Policies Committee (APC). L. Pedrotti reported that the APC is developing a comprehensive policy to govern the initiation, discontinuation, suspension, reactivation, and renaming of graduate and undergraduate academic degree programs and the creation, discontinuation, merging, splitting, and renaming of academic departments. This document will draw together in a single framework current policies that are spread among some six different ASenate documents. This document is in its final stages of preparation and may be ready for consideration at the March meeting of the ASenate.

The APC is also developing a proposal to discontinue the University General and Graduation Competency Program. This proposal will be distributed widely in the next month. If the proposal goes forward after comment and consultation, it should be ready for consideration at the April meeting of the ASenate. Finally, ECAS has sent to the APC a proposal for a TESOL undergraduate certificate program and a proposal to discontinue the Bachelor of Science in Education in Art Education. These proposals will come before the ASenate this term.

Student Academic Policies Committee (SAPC). G. Doyle reported that the SAPC will present changed wording regarding the 18th credit hour to ECAS and the ASenate for review. The revision will indicate that 2nd, 3rd, 4th students can take up to 18 credit hours without an additional tuition cost. First year students who have approval from their academic Dean may do so as well.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). L. Hartley reported that since January the FAC has met three times. The *Revision to Description of Faculty Outside Employment and Additional Services* proposal has been

the FAC's main topic of discussion. Next on the FAC's agenda is a revision of the Sabbatical Leave Policy. Pat Donnelly (Assoc Provost) has made revision suggestions based upon the need to correct an error, and providing clarity on due dates and report submissions. The FAC's next meeting will be held on February 25 @ 3:00 pm in Roesch Library 205. L. Hartley then reviewed changes made to the Outside Employment document by the FAC. Discussion of the document followed this presentation.

H. Gerla raised several issues with the document: 1) there is no definition of "professional employment" as opposed to "employment"; and, 2) the discrepancy between the procedures specified in III.A. (outside professional employment) and III.B. (outside employment unrelated to professional and academic enrichment). He also stressed that this policy represents a reporting *not* a permission system. The policy doesn't prohibit *nor* allow faculty to engage in only 8 hrs/week of outside employment. Instead the policy prohibits outside employment that would result in a "conflict of interest" or a "conflict of commitment". S. Hughes suggested that the draft document doesn't clearly address the reporting versus permission issue since the document currently requires that a "request for approval" form be filled out prior to engaging in outside employment. H Gerla agreed that the form and other items in the document would need to be changed (particularly III.C.).

G. Doyle asked that further clarification of the 8hrs/week versus one day/work week issue also be clarified. S. Gratto (MUS) argued that Music faculty often work 7 days/week in some form of creative activity (performances, guest conducting) that is external to their work at UD. Although this work is external it does inform a faculty member's teaching and work with students. In addition, some departments employ Artists-In-Residence and although they are fulltime faculty they work for other universities because they make very little money. She also argued that the term "product" (see II.I.) needs to be clarified in the document. Does this include bios that are part of an event program and include a reference to a faculty member's affiliation with UD? She also argued that the reporting system in the current draft is ineffective.

J. Robinson (BIO) supports limiting the policy to professional work only and remains concerned about the appeal process contained in the current draft. She urged the FAC to put in place an impartial committee that would review appeals to a denial of outside employment. J. Rowe (BIO) argued that the document represents the implementation of a corporate policy into an institution of higher education and will result in more restrictions as well as increased bureaucracy. He discouraged implementation of policy because it will increase administrative costs.

S. Hughes argued that an impartial committee would not be able to handle a "conflict of interest" appeal since the committee would not be privy to all university contractual commitments. S. Gratto argued that she is opposed to faculty members being required to seek permission for outside employment when they are not under contract. J. White pointed out that if a faculty member is not compensated for developing an on-line course then the course is their intellectual property. However, under this outside employment policy they would be unable to benefit from that course development. J. Herrelko (EDT) also expressed concern about how "conflict of interest" would be determined since faculty members in teacher education currently have a mandate from the Ohio Department of Education to work with other universities. C. Phelps then concluded the discussion by indicating that at the FAC's next meeting they would review the comments made during today's ASenate meeting. She thanked ASenate members and guests for their comments.

Executive Committee of Academic Senate (ECAS). C. Phelps reported that ECAS recently heard a report from the SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching) Committee on items for the revised SET instrument. There is a FES scheduled for February 26 on the SET instrument and ECAS will assist in setting up a faculty forum in March for all interested in hearing about the committee's work.

C. Phelps reported that ECAS is developing an ad hoc committee to review consultation processes between the Senate and university administration. Although the work of the committee is not expected to be completed this term, ECAS will continue to report on the committee's work this semester. ECAS recently had a discussion of the Background check form after concern was brought forward from a faculty member. The form has changed considerably from the original form in the Senate document. The revised form is a standard form used for all employees although not all of the types of checks listed are actually conducted. Pat Donnelly spoke with ECAS and assured ECAS that for faculty, the check consists of a criminal background and public court records. A statement regarding the types of checks run will be built into People Admin, although the form will stay the same.

Reports:

Deltak. P. Vanderburgh (Assoc Provost, Graduate Academic Affairs) explained the services Deltak is contracted to provide to the university. These services include the recruitment of students and instructional design. The contract involves a split revenue model so that Deltak is compensated on the number of enrolled students. A Senate members and guests discussed the ramifications of this contract for the university, students, and faculty.

K. Mosser asked if UD's admission standards preclude Deltak from "dumping" students into our programs and courses. He also expressed concern about the aggressive recruitment of students who may be unable to pay back their student loans. P. Vanderburgh indicated that UD admission standards would be applied to students seeking admission to any of the on-line programs.

J. Greenlee asked if UD would be the only Deltak partner university offering a particular on-line degree program. P. Vanderburgh indicated that would not necessarily be the case. P. Polanski (EDC) asked what percentage of tuition Deltak will receive. P. Vanderburgh indicated that Deltak will initially receive one-half (50%) of gross tuition. M. Kelly (EDT) asked who is responsible for quality control of these on-line courses. P. Vanderburgh replied that it is UD's responsibility to maintain the quality of these programs.

K. Kinnucan-Welsh (SOEAP) asked if OBR (Ohio Board of Regents) approval was needed for on-line Teacher Education programs. P. Vanderburgh confirmed that OBR approval is needed for these programs. She also asked whether Teacher Education programs needed state authorization from another state's Department of Education to teach students from another state. P. Vanderburgh confirmed that state authorization would be required.

D. Sanfilippo asked about enrollment benchmarks for these on-line courses. P. Vanderburgh indicated that we need to keep courses viable by having at least 8-10 students per course and that each course would be limited to 20 students. S. Hughes asked about the ramifications of launching a new on-line program with Deltak and then in 2-3 years wanting to discontinue the program. P. Vanderburgh indicated that the discontinuation decision would be up to the university and the ramifications of that decision would need to be worked out with Deltak.

Net Tuition Program. K. Harmon (Asst VP, Financial Aid/Scholarships) gave an overview of federal reporting provisions and the new tuition program. A discussion of the new tuition program followed.

G. Doyle asked how the new tuition program would impact co-op students. K. Harmon indicated that the university is committed to working with these students and their families but that all the details have not yet been worked out. R. Monnier asked which students will see tuition changes over a four year period. K. Harmon indicated that students in good standing (based on FT status and GPA) will not see tuition changes over the 4-year program. Their out of pocket 4-year tuition cost will not change however housing and meal plan costs will continue to be variable. D. Sanfilippo asked how the new tuition program will affect current students. K. Harmon indicated that the university will combine fees for current students with tuition and that they are still subject to increases in tuition.

E. Hicks asked about the potential risks of implementing this new tuition model. K. Harmon indicated that the university anticipated some sticker shock and possible discontent from current students. She stressed the need to really communicate well with current students. J. Saliba added that the new tuition initiative is an attempt to be as transparent as possible with students and their families. The university will now have a relatively fixed income for 4 years and families will have a much better understanding of their out-of-pocket expenses. The university understands that its expenses will increase over time so we will need to be fiscally diligent about saving money each year.

P. Analogue asked how fees, now combined with the cost of tuition, will be returned to individual departments. J. Saliba indicated that the administration is working hard to identify fees and how much was returned to departments over the last five years. Units will not be short changed for fees they were relying on previously.

Tuition Remission. J. Carter (VP, Human Resources) gave an overview of the new tuition remission program. She reported that 243 dependents of UD employees are currently taking classes at UD. These dependents are not paying tuition but are paying fees. With the current 100% tuition remission program some dependents pay more money for fees than others. The new 95% tuition remission program will require all dependents to pay the same amount because tuition and fees have been combined under the new tuition program.

K. Webb expressed concern that FT staff members who take graduate classes will see a dramatic increase in their tuition costs since these individuals generally don't pay fees thus their tuition costs will actually increase with the new 95% tuition remission program. C. Merithew asked about grandfathering current employees into the 100% tuition remission program. J. Carter answered that the option had been considered but rejected. L. Pedrotti argued that the 95% tuition remission program would actually represent a reduction in benefits for these FT staff members.

Master of Physician Assistant Practice (MPAP) Program (DOC 2013-01). K. Kelly (Dean, SOEAP) reviewed the MPAP program proposal process. K. Kelly then made a motion to approve Senate DOC 2013-01. The motion was seconded by E. Hicks.

C. Daprano then asked if any consideration would be given to qualified students who wanted to enroll in the MPAP program after graduating with their undergraduate degree from UD. P. Analogue indicated that such an articulation agreement was being put in place for the DPT graduate program so that a specified number of qualified UD undergraduates would gain admission to the DPT program upon completion of their undergraduate degrees. K. Kelly indicated that the DPT program is a mature program and that initially this type of agreement would not be considered for the MPAP program.

L. Leming requested that the ASenate note the recommendation from the APC (see **2.3 Recommendation of the Academic Policies Committee**) which is intended to encourage greater attention to medical ethics and diversity within the MPAP curriculum. K. Kelly responded that these topics would be incorporated into the Applied Assessment courses and others throughout the program. He also indicated that this concern and the recommendation of the APC were duly noted.

H. Gerla made a motion to vote on Senate DOC 2013-01 and this was seconded by G. Doyle. **The motion to approve Senate DOC 2013-01 "Master of Physician Assistant Practice (MPAP) Program" was then approved by a vote of 31 approved; 0 opposed; 1 abstained.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano