

2-25-2013

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2013-02-25

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 2013-02-25" (2013). *All Committee Minutes*. 190.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/190

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 (FAC) of the Academic Senate (approved 9-5-13)
Meeting Minutes for February 25, 2013

In attendance: Linda Hartley (Co-chair), Monish Chatterjee, Donald Shimmin, Emily Hicks (Co-chair), Corrine Daprano, Ralph Frasca, Pat Donnelly (ex-officio), Carissa Krane, Kevin Kelly, Sheila Hughes

Absent: Kathy Webb, Harry Gerla, Paul McGreal, Caroline Merithew, Art Jipson

The meeting was held in Room 205 of the Roesch Library. It commenced at 3 pm with 10 members in attendance. The following is a summary of the discussions that occurred.

1. The minutes of the previous meeting (Feb. 11, 2013) were reviewed and approved unanimously with one amendment (added 'ex-officio' next to Pat Donnelly's name).
2. On the matter of Revision #1 of the Sabbatical Leave Policy, line 4 of the proposed language for section 4, item B.1 was modified to read "...sabbatical invitation in the Spring of their sixth academic year....University." The rationale offered for this change was that junior faculty on tenure track typically come up for tenure review in Fall of their sixth year. Therefore, if the sabbatical invitation is extended to them in the Spring of the sixth year, then, following the tenure decision process, they may commence their sabbatical in their eighth, ninth or tenth year.
3. On the matter of Revision #2 of the Sabbatical Leave Policy, it was proposed that line 1 in section 2, item C.3 be modified to read "Within thirty days of the start of the subsequent semester (Fall or Spring), the sabbatical recipient sabbatical work." The rationale for this was to clarify that by subsequent semester, one of the academic year semesters, and not summer, is implied.
4. Dr. Donnelly suggested modifying the language in the above section to emphasize the sequential order of the review and approval process relative to the sabbatical reports. In the interest of efficiency, however, it was proposed that the sabbatical recipient should submit the report simultaneously to the sabbatical review committee and the department Chair, from where the document and feedback would move sequentially. Accordingly, the revised language would read:

Within thirty days.....subsequent semester (Fall or Spring), the sabbatical recipient ... Sabbatical Review Committee and the Department Chair a summary report ... sabbatical work. The Committee should offer feedback to the recipient and forward the report and its feedback to the Chair. The Chair should provide feedback and send the report and the Committee and Chair

feedback to the Dean. The Dean will forward the report and Committee and Chair feedback to the Associate Provost for Faculty and Administrative Affairs.

5. In line 1 of Revision #3 of section C under Sabbatical Periods, Plans, Appointments, Reports, the date August 15 was revised to August 16. Thus the line now reads “Term: Sabbaticaleither August 16 or January 1 period.”

6. For consistency, the word ‘chair’ was replaced by ‘chairperson’ throughout the suggested revisions.

The proposed amendments to the Sabbatical Leave Policy revisions were voted upon, and were all approved with 9 Yes, 0 No and 1 Abstention. The document will be reformatted according to Senate policy, and sent to ECAS with a request that the revision proposal be placed on the March 15 Academic Senate meeting for discussion and vote.

7. The Outside Employment proposal and revisions were discussed at length. Section IIB was discussed extensively. Questions were raised about the specification of the eight-hour limit, and whether such a limit existed in the staff policy also. It was affirmed that indeed the limit exists in the staff policy. The “Guideline” insert introduced by Dr. Harry Gerla was reviewed. It was eventually decided that much of the language in the insert would be retained, except for:

- (i) Remove the word “Guideline”.
- (ii) Remove the entire last sentence, “Full-time UDthis policy.” This also includes the part on “generally free to work” which had caused some concern.
- (iii) Modify the first line to read “In general, time spent on outside employment during contractual periods which exceeds raise no such concerns.”

8. In section IID, it was proposed to take out the words “Outside Consulting” from the section heading, as outside consulting also implies outside employment.

9. It was decided that the subsections (A-F) of section II should be re-ordered to flow more logically. Dr. Hartley agreed to draw up the re-ordered list with the amendments as suggested above.

10. A great amount of time was invested on the revisions in section III of the Outside Employment proposal, which deals with the Process for Faculty wishing to pursue outside employment. Several members voiced the opinion that distinctions between “professional” and “non-professional” should be dispensed with, since professional per se cannot be defined monolithically. Debate ensued regarding the person upon whom “approval” of the outside employment description submitted by the faculty member was vested. It was felt by some that approval would have to come from the Provost, while the Chair and the Dean would provide

recommendations. Some members questioned whether or not this proposal should include section III. which suggests a specific process.

11. It was proposed that IIA be revised to read: “Prior to committing to any outside (take out “professional”) employment, a faculty member must provide a written(e.g., Chair). The faculty member should use the form [new form specifically adapted for faculty].”

12. It was proposed that Section IIID be further amended to read “An annual request for approval...employment during contractual or non-contractual period may be submitted in August 12 months....”

13. On the issue of whether ‘approval’ should be in the language of the Process or not, a straw vote was taken. The results were 4 Yes, 4 No, and 1 Abstention.

14. Discussion of the Process section remained incomplete. It was decided that section III will be “cleaned up” and re-written (with an Option A without approval, or option B with approval), and then the amended document will be deliberated/voted upon by email within one week, prior to the March 6 ECAS meeting.

15. Discussion of the proposed Impartial Review Committee (proposed by the Science chairs) was discussed very briefly with pros and cons articulated. Further discussion should take place so that all members have a voice and a conclusion can be reached.

Next FAC meeting: March 11 in 113B, St. Mary’s, 3-4:15 pm.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted-

Monish R. Chatterjee

Feb 26, 2013