

9-21-2012

## 2012-09-21 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2012-09-21 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2012). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 89.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins/89](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/89)

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](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

Approved  
Minutes of Academic Senate  
Friday, September 21, 2012; 3:00 p.m.  
KU West Ballroom

**Present:** Paul Benson, Caroline Merithew, Shelia Hughes, John Clarke, John McCombe, Kurt Mosser, Leno Pedrotti, Carissa Krane, Andrew Ewvaraye, Anthony Whaley, Arthur Jipson, Laura Leming, Sarah Kerns, Paul Bobrowski, Terence Lau, James Dunne, Ralph Frasca, Kevin Kelly, Philip Anloague, John White, Ruth Monnier, Tony Saliba, Vinod Jain, George Doyle, Jarred White, Paul McGreal, Henry Gerla, Paul Vanderburgh, Robyn Bradford, Kathy Webb, Emily Hicks, Donald Shimmin, Karen Swisher, Corinne Daprano

**Guests:** Jonathan Hess, David Darrow, Maura Donahue, Don Pair, Pat Donnelly, David Wright, Francisco-Penas-Bermejo, Katie Kinnucan Welsch, Emily Kaylor, Rebecca Wells

**Absent:** Hussein Saleh, Partha Banerjee, Allie Michel, Joseph Saliba

**Opening Meditation:** John McCombe opened the meeting with a meditation

**Minutes:** Minutes of the April 27, 2012 meeting were approved

**Announcements:**

The next meeting of the Academic Senate is October 19, 3:00-5:00 p.m. in KU Ballroom.

C. Phelps announced that UD is switching to paperless grades and so hard copies of a student's grades will no longer be sent to their home address. This will allow students faster access to their grades, greater confidentiality, and lower costs.

**Committee Reports:**

**Academic Policies Committee (APC).** L. Pedrotti reported that the Academic Policies Committee (APC) held its first organizational meeting on Monday September 17. The next two meetings of the APC will be on Monday October 1 from 11-12 pm in KU 311 and on Monday October 15 from 11-12 pm in KU 311.

The APC is charged with oversight of the Committee on the Common Academic Program and Competencies (CAPCC). This semester the CAPCC is finalizing its procedure document, which will require APC approval. Other business currently before the APC is a charge from ECAS to develop a formal process for the renaming of a unit of the University. The APC now has an open group site on Porches. Next week L. Pedrotti will populate that site with minutes, agendas, and documents of interest to APC members. Any member of the University community can join the APC group.

**Student Academic Policies Committee (SAPC).** G. Doyle reported that the SAPC is working on the following: 1) scholarship distribution; 2) summer tuition proposal; 3) review of 1995 document that established the 18<sup>th</sup> credit hour policy; 4) examination of academic honesty for on-line courses issue; and, 5) review of tuition refund policy. The next meeting of the SAPC will be September 24 at 2 PM.

**Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC).** E. Hicks reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee met on September 14, 2012 to continue discussion and revision of Doc 12-10 Revision to Description of Faculty Outside Employment and Additional Services proposal.

**Executive Committee of Academic Senate (ECAS).** C. Phelps reviewed the handout prepared by the SET (Student Evaluation of Teaching) Committee updating the ASenate on the work the committee accomplished this summer and a timeline of additional work they plan to accomplish this academic year.

**Senate DOC 12-11 Proposal to Rename the School of Education & Allied Professions (SOEAP).** K. Kelly reviewed the rationale for changing the name of the school to the School of Education and Health Sciences. C. Phelps announced that **Senate DOC 12-11 Proposal to Rename the School of Education & Allied Professions (SOEAP)** will be sent to the Provost.

**Senate DOC 12-12 Proposal to Rename the Department of Languages.** P. Benson reviewed the rationale for changing the name of the Department of Languages to the Department of Global Languages and Cultures. C. Phelps announced that **Senate DOC 12-12 Proposal to Rename the Department of Languages** will be sent to the Provost.

### **Business Issues**

**Senate DOC 12-09 Faculty Workload.** E. Hicks made a motion to un-table Senate DOC 12-09. The motion was seconded by H. Gerla. **The motion to un-table Senate DOC 12-09 “University Guidelines for the Allocation of Responsibilities for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty” for discussion was approved by a vote of 31 approved; 3 opposed; 1 abstained.**

E. Hicks indicated that no changes have been made to the document since the last ASenate meeting in April since the FAC felt the document needed more consultation and discussion. She encouraged senators to send her comments.

P. Vanderburgh speaking on behalf of the Office of the Provost indicated that the intent of the faculty workload guidelines is to: 1) promote variability; 2) allow for that variability to be managed by the Deans in a timely manner; 3) ensure the Deans start (not end) at the same baseline point. He pointed out that there is no intent to elevate teaching as more important than research or service. Since teaching is more directly tied to resources however it does help set the workload baseline. He also argued that the revised workload guidelines are not substantially different from the existing guidelines. Deans and chairs already have discretion to make variations to the existing guidelines.

J. Dunne then discussed the SBA’s workload policy and the possible implications for competing with other universities in terms of faculty hires and retention in the revised workload guidelines were put into place. He also wondered how the phrase “fully engaged in totality of responsibilities” would be interpreted and why the phrase “engaged in significant peer review research” had been removed in the revised guidelines. J. Dunne indicated that a Statement of Principles was drafted and approved by 33 tenured/tenure track SBA faculty. He passed out hard copies of the statement to those in attendance with the stipulation that the statement be added to the ASenate minutes. The statement is appended to these meeting minutes.

T. Lau stated that the statement is not meant to be argumentative or antagonistic. The SBA faculty felt it was important to formally voice their concerns regarding the SBA standard for faculty workload. E. Hicks asked why there was no SBA faculty signatures attached to the document. T. Lau indicated that the signatures are on file but names will be kept confidential to protect tenure track SBA faculty.

H. Gerla voiced concern that the revised workload guidelines appear to be deficient in some areas. He indicated three specific areas of concern. These include: 1) the need for explicit permission if a department/unit wants to vary from baseline workload norms; 2) the omission of a way to take into account the availability of non-university funding to subsidize lower teaching loads (ex. what happens if a department or unit finds a donor willing to fund a new positions or an endowed position?); and, 3) the School of Law’s ability to compete against peer institutions in regard to faculty hiring and retention if there are vast differentials with peers in terms of workloads. He acknowledged that these

considerations do not have anything to do with equity/justice concerns. However if these factors are not taken into consideration the School of Law (and other departments/units on campus) may find itself at a competitive disadvantage.

G. Doyle asked whether Legal Affairs had reviewed the revised document. P. Donnelly indicated that Legal Affairs had not been consulted. He also argued that the workload guidelines are not really being changed. The revised document merely gives the Provost/Deans more flexibility and guidelines when establishing unit workload policies. The revised guidelines establish expectations for teaching loads, there are no minimum standards. There is a need for a base from which to establish variances. These considerations are not all exclusive or inclusive of all variances. P. Donnelly reminded the senators that this issue was brought forward because of faculty concerns over workload policy inequities.

R. Frasca questioned how the revised document resolves issue of inequities. S. Hughes argued that the revised guidelines would increase transparency and accountability regarding variations in workload. Additionally, faculty would now have a better basis for understanding why workload variations exists and a sense that decisions are being made on the basis of the common good for all faculty.

J. Dunne asked for clarification as to why the document requires ASenate action in the form of consultation. P. Benson answered that the review and revisions to the document were initiated by an ad-hoc committee created by the Office of Provost. Thus, the committee has submitted the revised document to the FAC and ASenate for review and consultation.

**CAP (Common Academic Program) Update.** S. Hunley reviewed the work of the various CAP committees and other groups working to implement CAP.

G. Doyle asked if programs must submit their plan for fulfilling CAP Crossing Boundaries requirements to S. Hunley. L. Pedrotti indicated that the process would be similar to the approval process for General Education courses and programs of study. The CAP committee must approve all Integrative and Inquiry courses.

J. McCombe asked if an on-line version of the CAP course approval form was forthcoming. S. Hunley indicated that she was working with the Banner group to have an on-line process in place by the end of October. S. Hughes asked about the process for determining specific criteria for Diversity and Social Justice or Arts courses or Social Science courses. S. Hunley indicated that there will be two types of approval forms with requirements built into the forms. G. Doyle asked whether a list of courses approved for History, Social Science, and Philosophy would be created for faculty to refer to when advising students. S. Hunley indicated that a list detailing the courses that are acceptable in terms of fulfilling the CAP requirements will be created by the end of October.

C. Daprano mentioned the new series of Salons developed through the LTC to encourage more multi- and interdisciplinary faculty discussions and asked if some consideration could be made when scheduling the Salons next semester. The first two Salons scheduled this semester coincide with ASenate meetings thus excluding senators from participating in these sessions.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano

**STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES REGARDING FACULTY WORKLOAD  
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION FACULTY  
FINAL VERSION SEPTEMBER 17, 2012**

**WHEREAS**, the University Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (“FAC”) has proposed a significant revision to the Faculty Workload Policy (Senate Document 95-01); and  
**WHEREAS**, the revision labeled as Senate Document 12-09, presented to the Senate for consultation, raises areas of concern for the School of Business Administration (“SBA”); and

**WHEREAS**, SBA has identified its competitive schools (the top five cross-admits schools for undergraduates and top competitors for MBA students) as Miami University, Xavier University, Ohio University, Ohio State University, University of Cincinnati, and Wright State University; and

**WHEREAS** SBA has identified its aspirant schools (the top five Catholic undergraduate business schools from USNWR) as University of Notre Dame, Villanova University, Georgetown University, Boston College, and Santa Clara University; and

**WHEREAS** SBA is undertaking a strategic plan review to analyze and identify strategies to enable SBA to distinguish itself from its competitive schools while outlining a roadmap to improve and challenge aspirant schools within a specified period of time and making significant contributions to the University’s strategic initiatives; and

**WHEREAS** faculty workload guidelines (teaching load, expected achievements in scholarship, and service expectations) will be a critical driver in determining what kind of business school SBA will be in future decades and subsequently, its ability to make significant contributions to the University’s goals; and

**WHEREAS**, the Constitution of the University Senate provides that faculty shall propose or comment upon policies put forward for Consultation;

**NOW THEREFORE WE THE UNDERSIGNED**, constituting tenured and tenure-track faculty within the SBA, do hereby state the following principles regarding Faculty Workload.

**Principle 1**

We affirm Guideline 2 of the Senate document, which states that “Practices related to the distribution of faculty time and effort across academic responsibilities and the assignments of specific academic responsibilities rest with department chairs and/or Deans, and reflect unit policy.” We believe all within the UD community should follow this guiding principle.

**Principle 2**

We affirm our belief, based on the experience of our competitive and aspirant universities as well as the performance demanded by our standards for Promotion and Tenure, that faculty in the SBA categorized as “Research Active” under our AACSB accreditation standards should normally be assigned a maximum teaching load of fifteen semester hours per academic year (with due consideration to number of preparations, student credit hours generated, and other relevant factors). We also recognize that those who are not Research Active may be assigned additional teaching responsibilities.

**Principle 3**

We believe that any guideline from the Academic Senate on Faculty Workload should equally address the totality of a faculty member’s workload commitments, without placing undue emphasis on teaching load.

#### **Principle 4**

We endorse the principle that teaching loads (number of sections of courses taught per semester or per year) provide only one measure of teaching productivity. Another useful measure of teaching productivity is Student Credit Hours Generated. According to the UD Factbook, in 2010-2011 SBA generated 556.9 student credit hours per full time equivalent faculty. Based on this measure, the SBA is the most productive teaching unit on campus for the last five years.

#### **Principle 5**

SBA's current teaching load policy for research-active faculty allows SBA to recruit new faculty of the quality consistent with our current mission and future goals. SBA emphasizes a collegial work environment, one based on Marianist and community principles, a balanced teaching load of 3/2, research production, and providing service to the discipline, the University, and the community. Even with these attributes, most SBA hiring efforts require active targeting and engagement to recruit diverse and high quality Ph.D. graduates. Our teaching load policy allows us to remain competitive with peer and aspirant schools.

#### **Principle 6**

SBA Faculty are proud to deliver co-curricular activities that deliver excellence in teaching and distinguish the SBA. SBA Faculty are committed to enhancing student learning experiences through delivery of a core SBA initiative, theory-to-practice. Over the years, SBA has implemented innovative and groundbreaking programs to deliver on this objective, including faculty leadership and involvement in the Business Plan Competition, the Procter & Gamble Marketing Challenge, Flyer Angels, RISE, Flyer Enterprises, and the Davis Center for Portfolio Management, among many others. SBA Faculty also for years have designed and delivered capstone project courses that involve student teams working with organizations (both for-profit and non-profit), have managed business professional advisory councils to keep curricula up-to date and to facilitate projects and student internships and post-graduation hires, and teach core MBA classes with practicing executive partners, many entailing community projects. An increase in teaching load for SBA Faculty will likely eliminate or drastically reduce SBA's ability to innovate in the critical area of co-curricular program development.

#### **Principle 7**

We affirm our belief that the creation of new knowledge is a central and critical component of our vocation. SBA Standards for Promotion and Tenure as well as accreditation standards, emphasize scholarly contributions by requiring faculty to publish in Leading or High Quality journals only. We believe publication in these journals brings tremendous prestige to the University of Dayton.

**BE IT RESOLVED, THEREFORE,** that the SBA Faculty hereby adopt this Statement of Principles, and that SBA Senators or their designated representatives are hereby authorized to read this Statement of Principles into the official record of any meeting (minutes) of the Academic Senate.

Dated: September 17, 2012

Final voting results:

33 For

0 Against

0 Abstain