

4-13-2012

2012-04-13 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, "2012-04-13 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2012). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 82.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/82

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, April 13; 3:00 p.m.
KU West Ballroom

Present: Paul Benson, Linda Hartley, John McCombe, Jonathan Hess, Leno Pedrotti, Carissa Krane, Arthur Jipson, Laura Leming, Carolyn Phelps, Emily Kaylor, Terrence Lau, James Dunne, Rebecca Wells, Corinne Daprano, Philip Anloague, Megan Abbate, Partha Banerjee, George Doyle, Paul Vanderburgh, Antonio Mari, Kathy Webb, Emily Hicks, Kimberly Trick, Jesse Grewal, Joseph Saliba

Guests: Jim Farrelly, Carl Friese, Molly Schaller, Philip Doepker, Deb Bickford, Sharon Davis Gratto

Absent: Caroline Merithew, Sheila Hughes, Nicholas Michel, David Johnson, Kaitlin Regan, Joe Castellano, Dimitri Tsiribas, Kevin Kelly, John White, Tony Saliba, Vinod Jain, Joseph Radisek, Paul McGreal, Andrea Seielstad, Heather Parsons

Opening Meditation: James Dunne opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: Minutes of the March 16, 2012 meeting were approved

Announcements:

The next meeting of the Academic Senate is April 27, 3:00-5:00 p.m. in KU Ballroom.

The next UD Faculty meeting is May 10, 3:00-5:00 PM in Boll Theater, with a reception to follow in the Torch Lounge.

Linda Hartley reminded everyone of the upcoming Stander Symposium on April 18 and the Celebration of the Arts Opening Performance on April 17 at 8 PM at the Schuster Center.

Committee Reports:

Academic Policies Committee (APC). C. Phelps reported that the APC has been working with the CAP Competencies Committee on the: 1) CAP Course Approval form, and 2) Bylaws of the CAP Competencies Committee.

The APC does not plan to meet again this academic year.

Student Academic Policies Committee (SAPC). G. Doyle reported that the SAPC completed the following items related to the Academic Honor Code: 1) an appeal process was added to the Academic Dishonesty Incident Report form; and, 2) the Incident Report form has been made into a PDF format so it can be used electronically (the form must be printed to be used, it cannot be saved).

L. Leming asked when the Incident Report form becomes effective. G. Doyle answered that the Honor Code is effective now. He reported that starting in Fall, 2012 Associate Provost Donnelly will post the Incident Report form on his website and send an email to faculty/staff each semester notifying them of the location and instructions for using. He also sent an email to Bill Fischer asking that the Incident Report form be included in the 2012-13 student handbook.

The SAPC does not plan to meet again this academic year.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC). L. Hartley reported that since the last Senate meeting, FAC met twice - March 28 and April 10. We finalized the proposal for the revision of the University Faculty Workload guidelines, which was sent to ECAS on April 4. We feel confident that you will be seeing this document soon and hope that it will appear on the April 27 Senate agenda. We are suggesting that this revision replace the 1995 Faculty Workload Guidelines. The revision is titled: *University Guidelines for the Allocation of Responsibilities for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty*.

When you review this proposal, please understand that this is a document to guide Units as they develop their own policies for the allocation of responsibilities. It emphasizes the totality of responsibilities for tenured and tenure track faculty to include teaching, librarianship, research and scholarly activity, and service. The proposal also recognizes lecturer responsibilities and expectations.

The latest document we have been working on is a Proposal to Revise the Description of Faculty Outside Employment and Additional Services. The document recognizes that while faculty need to devote their full time effort toward their full-time position at UD, it is also understood that opportunities for significant professional and instructional enrichment outside their UD position can be positive experiences for the faculty member as well as for the university. One of the main differences between this revised proposal and the existing policy for faculty is the clarity of the number of hours for outside employment: "In general, the time spent on these outside commitments should not exceed an average of eight hours per week." This proposal is intended as a protection for the university and not as a restriction for faculty members. The document outlines the process to request permission for outside employment, as well as an appeal process, should someone be denied an outside employment request. With minor revisions made this week, FAC plans to send the document to ECAS shortly. The FAC will not be meeting again this academic year. Discussion of these documents followed L. Hartley's report.

G. Doyle asked how the 8 hour stipulation in the Outside Employment proposal would be policed. L. Hartley stated that the 8 hour guideline gives everyone a check point to use in reviewing requests to engage in outside employment. There is an approval process that will involve review of the request at several levels (chair, Dean, Provost).

J. Hess noted that there have been discussions of whether the Workload Guidelines and Outside Employment documents require legislative authority or consultative action. ECAS will discuss how to classify the documents at their April 16 meeting.

R. Wells expressed concern over the following items in the Outside Employment document: 1) the 8 hour stipulation which seems problematic especially as related to the contract period, and, 2) greater clarification of the terms "conflict of commitment", "conflict of interest", and "non-compete."

T. Lau asked if the ASenate planned to vote on the Outside Employment document this academic year. J. Hess answered that would depend on whether the document was classified as legislative authority or consultation. T. Lau stated that he believes this document needs faculty discussion/consultation regardless of what is decided in terms of the legislative action. He expressed concern that: 1) the document does not include a definition of "contractual relationships", and, 2) there is no time limit regarding requests for review.

J. Farrelly urged Senators to examine the existing document as well as the revised document which appears to be much more specific and burdensome. He noted that the Faculty Board will also be discussing this document and hoped as well that there will be time for additional faculty review.

S. Davis Grotto noted that there are discipline-specific concerns with the Outside Employment document particularly for faculty in the Arts. She also agreed with other Senators that the 8 hour stipulation seems overly restrictive.

Executive Committee of Academic Senate (ECAS). J. Hess reported that ECAS had decided for next year to move the Fall budget meeting to the end of January after the January Board of Trustees meeting.

J. Hess reported that there has been low student interest in running for ASenate student positions. He urged Senators to encourage their students to run for these offices.

J. Hess reported on a problem with a past ASenate document that was posted on the ASenate website and included the social security numbers of two people. The issue was resolved by removing that information from the document, and University Legal counsel has contacted the affected parties for follow-up on the issue. Other ASenate documents will be reviewed for potential issues.

J. Hess concluded by reminding standing committees chairs that their year-end committee reports are due at the next ASenate meeting on April 27.

Special Reports:

Committee on Senate Representation. Carl Friese, chair of the committee, reviewed the committee's report and recommendations. Discussion of the report followed C. Friese's review.

J. Dunne asked how the percentages in Table A. Apportionment of Faculty Representatives (1979 Formula), Column (a.) compared to the breakdown per unit in 2011. C. Friese indicated that the committee did not compare the percentages per unit from 1979 to 2011.

J. Hess noted that there had been some discussion within ECAS about deleting the FT/PT instructional staff from the faculty total but the implications of doing so would have a ripple effect on the other distributions. ECAS decided to leave the distributions alone at this point and then re-visit the numbers again after the 45 new faculty hires occur.

Suzhou Industrial Park (SIP) Update. Provost Saliba delivered a status report on the UD China Initiative (UDCI) and SIP update to the ASenate. He indicated that if we at UD truly believe it is important for our students to become global citizens then global learning and competencies need to be infused in our curriculum. Strategically we have been thinking about where UD should be positioned (what regions) and how we can make these programs sustainable. The idea is to develop rich and sustainable processes as well as relationships. Faculty development efforts are a critical piece of this process. We are also speaking to Chinese companies in order to create immersion opportunities for our students (co-ops/internships). He stressed that the opportunities would be for all UD students and not just those in the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) fields. He also added that UD is exploring the expansion of existing programs and opportunities in India. South America will be the next region of focus. SIP was specifically chosen for UDCI because UD already has relationships with many Chinese companies that are located in SIP.

Following this introduction Phil Doepker (ENGR) used PowerPoint slides to present the floor plans for the Bio Bay building in SIP to the ASenate. The first floor has been designated as the Innovation Center. T. Lau asked who will be occupying the spaces on the first floor. P. Doepker stated that the spaces will be occupied by US and Chinese companies, UD students, Chinese students, engineers, accountants, and others. G. Doyle asked if the Bio Bay building was intended to be used by the STEM disciplines only. J. Saliba answered that there would be

opportunities for all disciplines to take advantage of cross cultural connections/relationships. T. Lau asked who will be teaching the students who attend classes in the building and if UD plans to offer a 4 year undergraduate degree at UDCI. J. Saliba answered that there is no intention to offer a 4 year UD degree in China. P. Doepker added that UD faculty would be recruited to teach courses in China.

P. Doepker then discussed the floor plans for the second floor which will include classroom spaces and a UD Marianist History and Heritage Display Center; the third floor which is primarily an administrative floor with office spaces for partner companies and a distance learning center; the fourth floor which will house a conference center, labs and a continuing education center; and, the fifth floor which will have spaces for research labs.

E. Kaylor asked how student tuition and hosting fees will be determined for UD students who want to complete internships and classes at UDCI. J. Saliba indicated that tuition and housing fees will be the same as what students pay for UD tuition and fees. UD will pay student transportation costs to Suzhou because housing costs in China are so low. We are also pursuing scholarship opportunities with our Chinese partner companies. He again stressed that there would be internship/co-op and course opportunities for students in all disciplines and emphasized that the current list of partner universities in China covers more than the STEM disciplines. In addition, the list of partner companies (Lilly, GE, Delphi, Emerson, etc.) will provide a base for creating immersion programs for UD students and faculty. R. Wells followed by asking if UD students would have an opportunity to experience Chinese culture while attending UDCI since the SIP is an “enclosed” community. J. Saliba noted that the SIP is in the suburbs of the city of Suzhou but that public transportation has greatly improved in the past several years so there will be lots of opportunities to engage with the Chinese culture.

R. Wells asked about revenue projections for UDCI. J. Saliba indicated that the Institute was set up with a revenue neutral design. UDCI generated money will fund UDCI activities for the next 5 years. The 60,000 square foot Bio Building space was given to UD at no cost. UD’s presence in SIP is being used as a recruiting tool to recruit companies into the Industrial Park. In addition, the Chinese government has contributed \$5 million toward the renovation of the building’s spaces. UD needs to cover its operating and UDCI personnel costs. Revenue streams will include student tuition and professional fees/tuition.

T. Lau asked about issues of academic freedom specifically the faculty policies and governance issues that will need to be considered for faculty as well as the courses that will be delivered at UDCI. J. Saliba explained that UD courses will be governed by our policies and processes. We will need to continue to discuss issues of academic freedom and governance as we expand our educational programming at UDCI.

Senate DOC 10-01 (Amended) Guidelines for the Development of Bachelor’s Plus Master’s (BPM) Degree Programs – Amended.

P. Vanderburgh reviewed revisions made to the text of the Appendix (paragraph i., p. 6) of the document. Discussion of the document followed this presentation.

J. Farrelly asked how we are planning to honor the text in the graduate bulletin that was in place when someone entered a program. He noted that the graduate policies recently approved by the ASenate, specifically the Retake Policy, should not be implemented until August 1, 2012 when the new graduate bulletin is issued. J. Saliba suggested that there is a need to address this particular issue but at a later time since Senate DOC 10-01 Amended deals with guidelines for developing BPM degree programs and not graduate academic policies.

P. Vanderburgh made a motion to approve the revised Senate DOC 10-01 (Amended). The motion was seconded by A. Mari. **Senate DOC 10-01 (Amended) “Guidelines for the**

**Development of Bachelor's Plus Master's (BPM) Degree Programs – Amended”
was approved by a vote of 20 approved; 0 opposed; 0 abstain.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano