

10-25-2012

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2012-10-25

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee, "Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2012-10-25" (2012). *All Committee Minutes*. 164.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/164

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, October 25, 2012, 9:30 am – 11:00 am Roesch Library 205

Present: John Clarke, Corinne Daprano, Pat Donnelly (ex officio), Ralph Frasca, Harry Gerla (arr. 9:50 am), Emily Hicks, Sheila Hassell Hughes, Kevin Kelly (arr. 10:10 am), Carissa Krane, Paul McGreal, Caroline Merithew (left 10:40 am), Kathy Webb

Absent: Partha Banerjee, Art Jipson, Don Shimmin, students

- 1) The minutes of the Oct. 12, 2012 meeting were approved.
- 2) Discussion of the Revision to Description of Faculty Outside Employment and Additional Services proposal continued.

P. Donnelly and J. Clarke proposed a new point “F” to the Rationale section concerning academic freedom and an addition to point “B” detailing benefits of outside employment to the university. These changes were approved.

C. Krane discussed her findings about the inclusion of professional vs. personal compensated activities. She shared documentation from UDRI and WSU that addressed professional activities and conflicts of interest only. The group was divided on whether compensated personal activities should be disclosed in addition to compensated professional activities. One concern is that compensated personal activities can still create a conflict of commitment and should, therefore, be disclosed.

Several questions were raised: Are we trying to use this process for evaluation of performance? Is the process meant to “police” all outside activities? What is the intent? Would failure to disclose lead to termination?

The issue of disclosure vs. seeking permission was also discussed. P. McGreal commented that some accrediting standards require a process for annual disclosing. This process would account for 80+% of situations with new activities disclosed at the earliest possible time.

With a disclosure process, permission would be assumed unless an objection was raised by the Chair, Dean, or Provost Office.

K. Kelly explained his experience with an annual disclosure of professional activities process.

Participation is key—must be used by majority of faculty to be effective. There are community-wide benefits such as the University knowing more about the activities of the faculty.

Action:

1. Draft will be revised to include agreed upon changes and new language from P. Donnelly.

2. Two questions for the next meeting:

a) Why 8 hour average?

b) Appeals process?

Respectfully submitted by E. Hicks