

11-29-2012

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2012-11-29

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 2012-11-29" (2012). *All Committee Minutes*. 166.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/166

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, November 29, 2012, 9:30 am – 11:00 am Roesch Library 205

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

Absent: Partha Banerjee, Harry Gerla, Art Jipson, Paul McGreal, Don Shimmin, students

1) The minutes of the Oct. 25, 2012 and November 9, 2012 meetings were approved.

2) R. Frasca requested a clarification of the role of the FAC/Academic Senate with regard to Consultative documents and revisions of consultative documents. The concern is that the FAC/Academic Senate, on behalf of the faculty, could approve and commit themselves to an FAC-revised document (consultative in nature), which would not be accepted or enacted by the Administration. Several members of the committee joined the discussion to further clarify the role of the FAC/Academic Senate, the approval/disapproval process, and the repercussions of a positive/negative vote on a document.

P Donnelly explained the following:

- a. Both legislative and consultative documents voted on/approved by the senate require UD President approval for enactment.
- b. The Senate can vote to support a revised document, in which case it will go to the administration. The Provost can 1.) accept the revised document; 2.) refuse the revisions approved by the Senate and enact the original University Policy; 3.) decide to take the document back to the Senate for reconsideration.
- c. The Senate can also vote to not approve a document. The vote is not binding.
- d. The FAC can vote to not approve a document, in which case it would go to ECAS who could bring it to the floor of the Senate.

The discussion then moved on to DOC 12-09 Recommendations for Revision to the University of Dayton Faculty Workload Guidelines.

3.) S. Hughes distributed a hard copy of the 11/9/2012 revision of the University Guidelines for the Allocation of Faculty with word tracking. This revision was working draft for subsequent FAC discussion and further revision.

Discussion of the 11/9/2012 revised document resulted in FAC agreement for the following additional revisions:

- a. Replace “Guidelines” with “Guidelines” throughout the document.
- b. Replace “per year” with “per academic year” throughout the document.
- c. P. 3: Change “a maximum” to “the maximum” in the following sentences:
 “Otherwise, tenured and tenure track faculty members may be assigned up to the maximum of twenty-four credit hours per academic year. Non-tenure track full-time faculty are not normally expected to be fully engaged in research and service and therefore should be assigned the maximum of twenty-four credit hours per year.”
- d. P. 3: Replace “this norm” with “these guidelines” in the following sentence:
 Academic deans may develop policies that deviate from ~~this norm~~ these guidelines.....
- e. P. 3: Delete the word “norm” in the following sentence: “The number of course credit hours articulated ~~as the norm~~ in unit policies...”
- f. P. 3: Revise the following sentence to incorporate last two bullets on the Teaching list: “In addition, they should meet the University’s requirements for the delivery of the curriculum ~~and its responsibility for financial stewardship~~ and be in keeping with available resources.”
- g. Pp. 3-4. Revise/Reorder the bulleted list:

Revised first bullet: “Student credit hours per academic year”. (Removed “Course credit hours per year” from first bullet).

List “Actual student contact hours” as second bullet.

List “Nature and complexity of different courses” as third bullet

Add “Team teaching” after “Interdisciplinary approaches to integrated learning”.

- h. Remove final two bullets in the Teaching: Considerations list:

~~The need to maintain a competitive position with current and aspirational peer institutions for attracting and retaining well-qualified faculty members.~~

~~The availability of financial and other resources through sources other than the central administration of the University.~~

Note: These final two bullets were added by H. Gerla in an earlier revision of the document. The committee agreed to remove these two bullets because 1.) the content does not fit under the Teaching Considerations categorical list, and 2.) the content is described elsewhere in the document (preamble) (See 3.f. for revised language that incorporates this intent).

4. The committee voted 9-0 to accept the recommended changes/revisions to the document.

5. The committee voted 9-0 to forward the document, with the agreed upon revisions, to ECAS with the recommendation that it be brought to the full Senate for a vote at the December 14, 2012 meeting of the Academic Senate.

6. The FAC thanks John Clarke for his service, as he takes leave of the committee.

7. Action Items:

- A. E. Hicks will revise the workload document to include agreed upon and distribute to the FAC for comment/review.
- B. The revised document will be brought to the next ECAS meeting.
- C. The discussion of the outside employment document is postponed until the FAC reconvenes in Jan 2013.

Respectfully submitted by C.M. Krane

Approved: January 14, 2013