

4-15-2016

2016-04-15 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, "2016-04-15 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2016). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 121.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/121

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, mschlange1@udayton.edu.

Academic Senate Meeting
Approved Minutes
15 April 2016
Carissa Krane, President

Attending:

Senators: Anloague, Benson (Interim Provost), Biswas, Daprano, Dingle, Pierce, Dermusoglu, Jacobs, Edmonson, Eustace, Gabbe, Goodman, Haus, Hicks, Holcomb, K. Kelly, Krane (President), Krug, Merithew, Mashburn, Picca (Vice President), Seielstad, Slade (Secretary), Spaulding, Valenzano, Watkins, Webb, Whitaker, Wu, Zhang

Guests:

Connie Bowman, Sawyer Hunley, Linda Hartley, Susan Wulff, Paul Vanderburgh, Sarah Caholon, Mateo Chavez, Anne Crecelius, Markus Rumpfkeil, Mike Krug, Lee Dixon, Bill Trollinger, Sara Webber, Minh Ho, David Wright, Deb Bickford, Todd Smith, Jim Farrelly, Barbara DeLuca

1. Opening Prayer: Erin Dingle
2. Minutes of 11 March 2016
 - a. Approved by unanimous consent.
3. Announcements
 - a. Fostering Student Success Day
 - i. 12 May 2016 9:00-2:30 in LTC Studio and Forum
 1. RSVP with Beth Harrison
 - b. Graduate Student Showcase
 - i. Afternoon of Stander Symposium
 - c. The Stander Symposium will be the week of 18 April
 - d. Announcement about Incoming President Eric Spina's plan for a long-term strategic visioning process.
 - i. The process is not expected to impact unit level strategic planning, but is a time for him to learn about the university's future and to lay the groundwork for a long-term fundraising campaign.
 - ii. Details will be publicized as they unfold.
 - e.
4. DOC 2016-05 Revision to the Membership of UNRC
 - a. C. Krane presenting
 - i. Discussion
 1. Minor edit.
 - ii. Vote
 1. Unanimous
5. DOC 2016-06 Clinical and Courtesy Appointments

- a. C. Merithew (chair, FAC)
 - i. Review of the Charge from ECAS.
 - ii. Discussion
 - 1. Why faculty of practice rather than professor of practice?
 - a. The title “professor” indicates more of a rank than faculty; individual units can then build guidelines for other titles.
 - 2. Appointments of the faculty are made by the recommendation of the chairperson and the dean and are finalized by the Provost.
 - 3. Vote
 - a. Unanimous
- 6. APC Review of CAPC/2 year CAP Implementation Report
 - a. J. Valenzano (chair, APC)
 - i. Report appended as part of APC Year-end report.
 - 1. Discussion
 - a. For double majors: only one capstone
 - b. Targeted editing--what does this mean?
 - i. A carefully constructed charge to the APC can make the edits to the Senate Document in a judicious way.
 - c. Does targeted editing change our practice?
 - i. No, it is a recommendation for how to handle things going forward so that the Senate does not produce lots of small documents that make it hard for faculty to clarify the document.
 - d. We should not regard the document as chiseled in stone to avoid building ways around parts of the curriculum.
 - i.
- 7. Academic Senate Composition Working Group
 - a. C. Krane
 - i. A charge for a working group on Senate Composition.
 - ii. Call for further volunteers
 - 1. Committee taken as reported
- 8. Committee Reports
 - a. Submitted as appendices to the Minutes
- 9. DOC 2007-05 Approval of Revisions to the Senate Processes and Procedures Document
 - a. A.Slade presenting
 - i. Vote: Approval unanimous
- 10. Recognition of Senators
- 11. Adjournment of 2015-2016 Academic Senate
- 12. Seating of the 2016-2017 Academic Senate

- a. Brief Introductions
- 13. ECAS and Officer Elections
 - a. ECAS
 - i. Deo Eustace
 - ii. Carissa Krane
 - iii. Andrea Seielstad
 - iv. Emily Hicks
 - v. Jason Pierce
 - vi. Joe Valenzano
 - vii. Lee Dixon
 - viii. Mark Jacobs
 - ix. Corinne Daprano
 - b. President of the Senate
 - i. Joe Valenzano
 - c. Vice-president of the Senate
 - i. Carissa Krane
 - d. Secretary of the Senate
 - i. Emily Hicks
- 14. Meeting of Subcommittees
 - a. Please report the name of the subcommittee Chairs to the Senate President
 - i. FAC Chair
 - ii. APC Chair
 - iii. SAPC Chair

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Slade, Secretary to the Academic Senate 2015-2016

Appendix

ECAS Report

Report on the Activities of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
2015-2016

Membership: Philip Anloague, Paul Benson, Erin Dingle, Jim Dunne (Fall 2015), Joseph Haus, Emily Hicks, Mark Jacobs (Spring 2016), Carissa Krane (Chair), Leslie Picca, Jason Pierce, Andrea Seielstad, Andrew Slade, Dorothy Spaulding

Guest from Faculty Board: Janet Bednarek

Summary of work conducted in 2015-2016:

The ECAS, on behalf of the Academic Senate, performed the following:

1. *Reviewed the following proposals prior to moving to the Academic Senate:*

- DOC 2015-02 Proposal for Bachelor of Science in Education, Middle Childhood Education/Intervention Specialist (approved October 16th, 2015).
- DOC 2015-03 Master of Finance (approved November 13th, 2015)
- DOC 2015-04 Undergraduate Academic Certificate Programs (approved December 11th, 2015)
- DOC 2016-01 Creation of the Department of Electro-Optics and Photonics (approved February 19th, 2016)
- DOC 2016-02 Merger of the Department of Engineering Management & Systems with the Department of Engineering Technology (approved February 19, 2016)
- DOC 2016-03 Master of Professional Accountancy (MPAcc) (approved March 11, 2016)
- DOC 2016-04 Undergraduate Course Retake Policy Revision (approved March 11, 2016)
- DOC 2016-05 Revision to the Membership of the University Nominating and Recruitment Committee (approved April 15th, 2016)
- DOC 2016-06 Clinical and Courtesy Appointments (approved April 15th, 2016)

2. *Consulted on the following issues/topics:*

- Met with registrar Tom Westendorf and Jennifer Creech to discuss necessary revisions to the course retake policy.
- Utilized the UNRC to recruit and identify a pool of faculty willing to serve on search committees for VP for Advancement, VP for EM&M, VP for Diversity and Inclusion, Provost. The ECAS narrowed the pool of faculty nominees for each pool based on the requests made by each specific search chair.
- Consulted on the job descriptions, and participated in pre-Search meetings for the VP for Diversity and Inclusion, Provost and VP for EM&M.
- Facilitated the gathering of information and feedback from the campus community on the draft Statement on Conducting Research and Restriction on Research Policy and provided follow-up recommendations to VP Fr. Jim Fitz, and VP John Leland post-Senate discussion.
- Recruited and approved membership of the UNRC.
- Recruited and approved representation on the HRAC.
- Approved several appointments to CAP-C.
- Met with VP Andy Horner, VP Troy Washington, and legal affairs council Lisa Sandner to discuss a draft Staff Promotion Policy; discussion lead to the submission of a memo that included recommendations for revisions to the policy.
- Met with VP Troy Washington to discuss the recommended revisions to the Staff Promotion Policy draft; the discussion lead to the submission of a second memo that reiterated recommendations for revisions to the policy.
- Met with Associate Provost Paul Vanderburgh to discuss the articulation agreement with Sinclair Community College.

- Generated a charge for a Senate Voting Rights and Senate Representation working group.

3. *Senate Officer actions taken on behalf of the Senate/ECAS:*

- The Senate President served on the Presidential Search Committee as a representative of the Academic Senate.
- The Senate President attended the open sessions (and other events) of the May 2015, September 2015, and January 2016 Board of Trustees meetings.
- The Senate President met and consulted with the chair of the Board of Trustees.
- The Senate President represented the Senate/ECAS on Provost Council, and President's Council.
- The Senate President/VP/Secretary represented the Senate/ECAS on UPCC and the IEC/PC meetings.
- The Senate President co-chaired the ELC.

4. *Ongoing Issues List for 2016-2017:*

- Information Literacy Task Force Report: Due Fall, 2016.
- Academic Senate Voting Rights and Senate Composition Working Group; Working Group fact finding report due to ECAS September 1, 2016.
- Proposal for an academic certificate program in applied creativity and innovative perspective, submitted by Brian LaDuca and faculty from the SOE.
- Invite VP Troy Washington to present an update on Health Benefits issues and decisions for 2017 at an Academic Senate meeting in early Fall, 2016.
- Senate review of University policies needed to implement new clinical faculty titles.
- Research Policy/Statement on Research: Continue to pursue consultation with the full Senate and help to facilitate a broader campus wide discussion facilitated through the Provost's office, in consultation with the Deans.
- Re-examination of the 100% compensation rule.
- Consultation with Marketing on comprehensive University-wide marketing strategy.
- Participation and leadership in the upcoming university strategic planning discussions.
- Continue to find ways to inform and engage the campus community in order to increase participation in the actions and functions of the Academic Senate (including elections to the Senate).
- Continue Academic Senate oversight of CAPC/CAP.
- Continue hearing reports from UNRC/HRAC.
- Continue to develop strong consultative relationships with administrators.

*Note: 2015-2016 Year-End Reports from the UNRC and HRAC are included as part of the appendices to the minutes of the April 15, 2016 Senate Meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Carissa Krane

.....

APC Year-end Report
Joseph Valenzano III, Chair

First, I wish to sincerely thank my colleagues on the APC. All of them dedicated a significant amount of time to our not-insignificant work this academic year and did so with a genuine desire to do what was right. We met almost every week this year to complete our tasks, and as a result here are some highlights of what was accomplished:

- We reviewed and recommended approval of a new Electro-Optics and Photonics Department
- We reviewed and recommended approval for the merger of the Department of Engineering Management and Systems with the Department of Engineering Technology
- We reviewed and recommended approval for a new Master of Finance Degree
- We reviewed and approved a new Master of Professional Accountancy
- We completed and the Senate passed a policy for Undergraduate Certificate Programs
- We completed and the Senate passed a new Course Retake Policy for the University

I may have missed some things in our work, but even this list represented an enormous amount of work. In fact, it is almost 300pgs worth of documents for which we reviewed, discussed, and recommended edits. We met with department chairs, program directors, the Registrar, and myriad others to properly vet each of these items, and again, the members of the APC deserve a tremendous amount of credit for their unwavering dedication and commitment to doing this work the right way, and in one academic year.

Despite all of this work, the most time consuming and complicated task was tackling the 2-year review of CAP. Despite some of the thorny issues this contained, our conversations were always serious, civil, and conducted in a way with the best interests of the university and our students in mind. For my mind, this has been the best committee I have been a part of since I came to UD. For the remainder of this report I want to focus on detailing the work we completed regarding CAP. I want to emphasize by way of Winston Churchill, that as far as CAP and CAP reviews go, "This is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

As the Senate document clearly spells out, the CAP-C is a subcommittee of the APC, and so the issues we addressed this term in the APC were done so with this

structure in mind. One of the first, and ultimately in my view most important, changes we implemented to the APC pertained to its relationship with the CAP-C. As a subcommittee of the APC, there should be consistent and clear lines of communication between the two committees. Unfortunately, this had not been the case for quite some time, and so the APC decided, and the CAP-C enthusiastically supported, the notion that the chair of the CAP-C would attend an APC meeting each month to provide details on the work being done in the subcommittee, and see direction or consultation on issues that arise where that conversation would be helpful. This periodic conversation will hopefully allow for a nimbler response when issues arise, and for the APC as a body of the Senate to maintain our important role in curricular development.

As we began to examine the CAP-C two-year review and discussed CAP with numerous parties, including CAP-C and the Provost's Office, it became clear through the implementation of CAP that there were several issues that needed to be addressed. This Spring, we took action on them in ways we felt were prudent.

The first issue pertained to the Natural Sciences component of CAP. The chairs of the Natural Sciences and the CAP-C requested that the APC provide clarification on some of the language in the Senate document detailing this component of CAP. Specifically, the following statements: "Students must take two three-hour lecture courses in the physical or life sciences or computer science;" and "Students will be exposed to at least two of the five disciplines: biology, chemistry, computer science, geology, and physics." After extensive deliberation on the language in the Senate document, the APC has issued the following clarification to the CAP-C regarding the Natural Sciences component: "The Natural Science component of CAP is meant to *introduce* students to concepts central to understanding the physical or life sciences or computer science. These introductory courses are currently best delivered through the Natural Sciences division of the College of Arts and Sciences. Therefore, CAP-C can only approve of courses to fulfill the natural science component of CAP that are created within the Natural Science departments." This clarification comes from an understanding of CAP as developmental, whereby courses in components such as the Natural Sciences, Humanities Commons, Mathematics, the Arts and Communication are meant to provide students with the basic knowledge required to conduct the interdisciplinary work that takes place in the advanced components of CAP.

The second clarification issued by the APC to the CAP-C related to the Mathematics requirement. Here the language of concern to the Math Department and the CAP-C was "all students will complete three hours in mathematics." Consistent with our clarification on the Natural Sciences question, we felt this component represented an introductory piece of CAP that allowed for interdisciplinary work at an advanced level once completed by a student. We felt that the way the component is written reflects the way Mathematics has developed their courses for non-majors, and thus the spirit of the document and the practice of our faculty indicate that the Mathematics department is to provide courses for this component of CAP.

Third, the committee tackled the issue of the Capstone, which has been a source of some consternation as every department has gone about creating one.

The APC was asked to weigh in on how the capstone impacts double majors, and whether it requires any integration with CAP as a whole. The issue arises from two statements in the Senate document: “all students will have a capstone in their major;” and, “The capstone will provide students the opportunity to engage in the scholarship, activity and/or practice of their major field and further the students’ understanding of their chosen vocation, career or profession.” In the first statement it seems to indicate that all students must have a capstone in each of their majors, which can actually serve to be a disincentive for double majors. Ultimately, the APC believes that the capstone is a requirement of CAP, but it belongs to the majors, and so majors must be empowered to decide how to handle double majors. In doing so, we wish to remind them that there are many roads that lead to Rome; the capstone need not be a three-credit course; it could be an Honor’s Thesis, field work experience, a non-credit bearing project, and departments can also create a path toward a capstone for those who are double majors that serves as an alternative to completing a three-credit capstone in each major.

In terms of connecting with CAP, the APC affirmed the approach taken by CAPC-C whereby capstone courses must address vocation and one additional SLO at the advanced level. However, it is impractical to evaluate capstones based on connection to prior courses students take within CAP because under CAP many roads lead to Rome, that is to say there are numerous routes one can take to completing it. The key connection to CAP is through the SLO requirement.

Finally, the APC examined the issue of course review and assessment as the first batch of courses due for review come up beginning Fall 2016. Under the Senate Document, CAP and its component courses must be assessed, reviewed and evaluated on a periodic basis. The CAP-C guidelines, established under the authority given that committee by the Senate, currently call only for departments who submitted the original course proposal to certify that the course continues to meet the CAP-requirements for those components for which it was approved. It is the position of the APC that this process is flawed, inadequate and in need of change. That said, the APC ran out of runway and could not fully develop a recommended means for this process moving forward. What we did do, however, was establish a temporary fix for those courses that come up for review next year.

Under the review process that will govern courses up for renewal during next academic year the proposers/department chair is to provide a brief, two paragraph, narrative describing how assessment has informed changes or improvements to the course, if any have been made. They are then to make any edits to the CIM document that reflect those changes and have a developmental consultation with the CAPC regarding the course. The CAP-C then may recommend renewal of the course for the appropriate category of CAP, request changes to the course in order to renew it for a category of CAP, or not renew the course. This is not a permanent solution, but it will allow time for a permanent solution to be identified.

In our deliberations regarding CAP the APC also feels the need to provide some recommendations regarding issues that the CAPC, APC and Senate as part of this report. First, although necessary, appropriate and judicious, we feel that we cannot maintain CAP by nesting clarifications around the original Senate document.

The Senate should consider targeted editing to the document to reflect the work of this year's APC so that CAP does not become overly burdensome for faculty to understand. Additionally, it is imperative due to the temporary fix provided for periodic course review and assessment, that the APC develop a permanent solution to this issue next year. We encourage the creation of a process that is both meaningful, and minimal in terms of work for faculty. Additionally, assessment, when done correctly, should be looked at as a tool to facilitate improvements in course development, not a tool to evaluate faculty or students. Third, we believe it might prove beneficial to examine the process for initiating a CAP class for ways to make it more collaborative, inviting and collegial. Finally, the Senate should monitor the SLOs and the relevant HIRs that they flow from to ensure they reflect ways in which they can be both achieved and assessed.

Although when I say them like I have here, these issues do not sound difficult or challenging, but they are because curriculum is something about which we all care deeply. In fact these issues should invite what authors Kerry Patterson and Joseph Grenny call "crucial conversations," but our deliberations should never devolve into nasty exchanges. I believe the way in which the Natural Sciences went about their request for clarification in this regard is particularly instructive. We also should not, especially when the curriculum is periodically reviewed, hold ourselves hostage such that the perfect becomes the enemy of the good. CAP is good. No, CAP is better than good, but it is not perfect. In fact, I would argue it should never be seen as perfect because when it is we stop thinking about the best way to implement our curriculum and develop our students. So, with an acknowledgement of the hard work ahead, faith in my colleagues and their commitment to our students and university community, and confidence that we will continue to engage in dialogue regarding the best way to proceed—even when our own opinions and positions may not carry that day--, I respectfully submit this report on the work of the Academic Policies Committee during Academic Year 2015-2016 to the Senate.

Report on the Activities of the Academic Policies Committee (APC) of the Academic Senate 2015-2016

Submitted by Joe Valenzano

Members: Phil Anloague, Deb Bickford, Jim Dunne (Fall), Kevin Kelly, Jasmine Lahoud, Jason Pierce, Andrew Slade, Paul Vanderburgh, Leslie Picca, Shuang-Ye Wu, Khristian Santiago, Serdar Dermusoglu (Spring), Deo Eustace

Faculty Board Guest: Jim Farrelly

The major activities of the APC this academic year involved the following:

Oversight of the Common Academic Program, (CAP)

In response to the two-year evaluation report on CAP delivered to the Senate, the APC discussed issues related to its implementation and issued clarifications to assist the CAPC in conducting its work. We issued clarifications regarding the Natural Sciences component, Mathematics component, Capstone component, the process for reviewing CAP courses and the requirement for assessment of CAP courses.

Review and Recommend Program Changes

--We reviewed and recommended approval of a new Electro-Optics and Photonics Department

--We reviewed and recommended approval for the merger of the Department of Engineering Management and Systems with the Department of Engineering Technology

--We reviewed and recommended approval for a Middle Childhood Intervention Specialist Program

--We reviewed and recommended approval for a new Master of Finance Degree

--We reviewed and approved a new Master of Professional Accountancy

Policy for Undergraduate Academic Certificate Programs

We concluded work on the Undergraduate Certificate Policy and it passed the Senate in Fall 2016.

Revised Course Retake Policy

We conducted a review of the university's Course Retake Policy in consultation with the Registrar's Office and identified areas in need of change. We wrote, submitted and the Senate passed a revised Course Retake Policy.

Committee Activities that will carry over into the 2016-2017 Academic Year include the ongoing oversight of the Common Academic Program.

.....
FAC Year-end Report

Faculty Affairs Committee
AY '15-'16 Report to the Senate

There were two issues that consumed the work of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) in Ay '15-'16: (1) Review of the revised guidelines of the University Nominating and Recruitment Committee (UNRC) and; (2) Revision of the Faculty Handbook to better reflect current practices in re: Clinical Faculty Titles. As for the first, the FAC worked with UNRC Chair, Shauna Adams, and ECAS.

The outcome of these efforts are reflected in Senate Document Proposal 2015-06 which will be voted on (through legislative authority) at the April 15, 2016 meeting. As for the second, FAC members spent the year consulting, researching, and revising language in the Faculty Handbook in regards to two categories: Clinical Faculty and Courtesy Titles (as reflected in Senate Document Proposal 2016-6) which will be voted on (through legislative authority) at the April 15, 2016 meeting. The committee also outlined – in response to the charge given by ECAS – other issues for which these changes will require attention.

The ECAS charge included 5 issues for FAC to address. The first is covered in above mentioned proposal (and reiterated below along with the other responses):

1. To propose a policy solution that resolves the inconsistency between the definition of Clinical Appointments to the Faculty as stated in the Faculty

Handbook and the current use of clinical titles, including but not limited to, the need for such titles in the School of Education and Health Sciences

This policy solution is presented (in a separate document also attached) in the proposal to the Academic Senate which requires legislative action. We hope to move this forward at the April 15 Senate meeting.

2. To examine the issues of rank and promotion for full-time, non-tenure track faculty who have Clinical Appointments to the Faculty

Though it understands the urgency and need for promotion of Clinical Faculty in regards to SEHS' programs, FAC's main concern about Clinical Faculty promotions is the roadmap by which these promotions will take place: How will Clinical Faculty/Faculty of Practice who hold titles that are "promotable," get promoted? What are the criteria upon which their work is judged and evaluated? How is this criterion similar to or different from traditional faculty's promotions? In the research the committee has completed, we have found that there is great variation in terms of work and expectations of Clinical Faculty/Faculty of Practice at UD as well as in our peer institutions.

Our discussions about this issue have also been informed by research that implies that there is a difference between *rank* and *title*.¹ FAC has reached

¹ See: Michael I. Shamos, Ph.D., J.D *Handbook of Academic Titles*
<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/?shva=1#search/phil/15367bd82593e33a?project=1>. Shamos' introduction is worth quoting and reviewing: "Distinguished Career Professor An "academic title," broadly, is a designation given to individuals who "engage in teaching of credit courses, academic research, or professional library service." (Oakland U.) Generally a title is relied on to convey three attributes of its holder: rank (level of appointment), status (Regular Faculty or otherwise) and function (Teaching, Clinical, Research, etc.) The title may also carry an Honorific, such as "Distinguished," as mark of special recognition. This much was recognized by W. S. Gilbert in referring to The Mikado's Lord High Executioner as "a personage of noble rank and title," making it clear that rank and title are different. "Lord" conveys nobility; "High" specifies rank; "Executioner" defines function. While this trichotomy is fairly logical, there is much confusion in practice between the concepts of "title" and "rank." Title ought to mean no more than the name by which an academic position is known, e.g. "Associate Professor of the Practice of Surgery." But such a statement is too simplistic; one must consider the distinctions among Official Title, Working Title and Functional Title. Rank refers to the holder's position in an ordered promotion sequence known as a Series. The fundamental Series in US institutions is {Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor}, which are listed in order of increasing rank. Titles not in this Series almost always indicate a position equivalent in rank to a particular rank in the Series. For example, at Carnegie Mellon the title "Senior Research Scientist" indicates a nontenured position ("non-noble," one might say), a function of Scientist and a rank equivalent to Associate Professor. The variety of academic titles in use is impressively vast. Numerous unusual situations have arisen at different institutions that have

consensus that there is a difference between *rank* and *title* and we encourage the administration to make clear that distinction. What this committee is proposing, in the end, has to do with *title* rather than *rank* (as referred to in the original ECAS charge).

3. To consider the campus-wide implications of a system of rank and promotion for all full- time, non-tenure track faculty;

Full time non tenure track faculty and lecturers are members of our community who contribute a great deal to the functioning and pedagogical excellence of UD. For these faculty, the implication for introducing the proposed alteration to the Faculty Handbook– e.g. change to description of Clinical Faculty as well as addition of Courtesy Appointments – is connected to issues for non-tenure track faculty. However, given the distinct type of work Clinical Faculty do – e.g. field work as well as oversight in a realm outside of the classroom – full non-tenure track faculty’s “promotability” can -- and should -- be treated as a separate issue. The FAC encourages the Provost’s office to concern itself with policies and procedures related to Clinical Faculty promotion (see below) and to consider similar issues related to other full time non-tenure track faculty, including -- but not limited to -- lecturers.

4. To identify a list of related policies and procedures to consider in conjunction with the Provost’s office

Because of the differences in Clinical Faculty/Faculty of Practice appointments across campus, there need to be policies and procedures in place that address the specific conditions these faculty work under. The Provost’s office should guide units in the creation of a clear set of guidelines in regard to promotion for Clinical Faculty/Faculty of Practice. Since promotion takes place within T&P committees, and these T&P committees have policies for traditional faculty members (e.g. not Clinical) that are based on Teaching, Research, and Service criteria, it is imperative that unique (but equivalently rigorous) policies be codified.

Given that we are introducing a new delimitation of Clinical Faculty, and also given the fact that this comes after the removal of a cap on the number of non-tenure line faculty (in 2009), FAC is concerned about an increase in this group. Both tenure line appointments as well as non-tenure track full time appointments are on the increase at UD. Because data collected on the latter group has been stated to be unreliable, FAC asks that consistent data be collected for a better understanding of the employment demographics here. This data should be reviewed every 3-5 years.

spawned the creation of carefully crafted titles to deal with specialized circumstances. If your institution is trying to create a title to describe a particular position, it has probably already been devised elsewhere and you will find it in this Handbook.

Tenure-line faculty members (and the protection that tenure affords them in regards to academic freedom and due process) is different than the protections (or lack thereof) for non-tenure track faculty.²

5. To develop a summary of the policies and practices of peer universities with respect to (a) clinical faculty and (b) titles, rank, and promotion of full-time, non-tenure track faculty.

In November, FAC members completed research on our peer institutions practices in regard to Clinical Faculty. This work is part of the revisions FAC proposes for the handbook and is behind many of the responses above. We also advise next year's committee to familiarize itself with the distinction between rank and title and the myriad uses of both.

SAPC Year-end Report

End of the year report to Senate
Student Academic Policies Committee
2015/16

SAPC's primary task this academic year was to revisit UD's political activities policies in advance of the election year. In recent years, members of our faculty have expressed the concern that our current policy curtails individual political expression and discourages political engagement. After reviewing the current document, comparing it to that of other private universities, and consulting with members of UD's legal team and the government liaison, SAPC concluded that the current policy is unclear and overly restrictive. Of particular concern was the prohibition against lawn signs on UD owned houses, and campaigning on UD grounds. SAPC presented a resolution to the senate during the December meeting requesting that the legal team, working with the university's government liaison, investigate the legal parameters for student activity in order to craft a policy with clear and affirmative guidelines for campus political engagement. The resolution was unanimously affirmed.

² See AAUP Report, "Status of Non-Tenure Track Faculty," June 1993 which states. "The growth of non-tenure-track faculty erodes the size and influence of the tenured faculty and undermines the stability of the tenure system. The large numbers of faculty who now work without tenure leave academic freedom more vulnerable to manipulation and suppression." <http://www.aaup.org/report/status-non-tenure-track-faculty>

In response to the resolution, a working group was assembled to research and address the implementation of the policy. A draft of the new policy was sent to the chair of SAPC on April 14, and, as of the last senate meeting of the year, has yet to be reviewed by the committee. At this point, what can be said is that lawn signs are still prohibited. However, students may now hang sheet banners and place outward facing signs in their windows.

Renewed discussion about UD's political activities policy came in advance of the latest policy draft, when nurses campaigning on behalf of Bernie Sanders were asked to leave campus. Myrna Gabbe (chair), acting on behalf of SAPC, met with UD's government liaison for clarity on the incident. Discussions on this matter remain ongoing.

SAPC also worked with APC to revise UD's retake policy.

Respectfully submitted,
Myrna Gabbe
Chair

.....
HRAC Year-end Report

**2015-2016 Human Resources Advisory Council (HRAC) Report for Academic Senate
April 15, 2016**

The HRAC met nine times since the April 2015 Academic Senate meeting. This report highlights important discussions from those meetings.

April 21, 2015

- David Sipusic, Title IX/504 Coordinator and Equity Compliance Officer for the University briefed the Council on the results from the recent climate survey facilitated by ModernThink.
- Susan Sexton provided February and March health claims costs. The charts show that the monthly fluctuations even out with predictions and 2014 trends.
- The High Deductible Health Care Plan (HDHCP) task force provided an update on their progress.
- Troy opened a discussion about the committee's expectations for future meetings.

May 19, 2015

- Susan Sexton provided April health claims costs which were lower than previous months. The overall trend is about the same expense as last year. Lowering the stop loss limit has proven to be a good idea.
- Noyra Valentin demonstrated a Banner upgrade with an anticipated release of July 1 to the Employee Profile dashboard in the HR Connections tab. The profile upgrade will provide employees self-service information to their personal profile, career and for supervisors, team profile information.
- The HRAC Charter was reviewed and suggested revisions were made.

June 19, 2015

- Susan Sexton provided the May health claims expenses which continued to project the same trend as last year's claims.
- A potential new long term care provider for the University was presented.
- Theresa Gilbert, Wellness Coordinator updated the HRAC on the wellness program.

July 15, 2015

- Beth Schwartz reviewed our elective benefits for vision and dental coverage, Supplemental life insurance, and long term care insurance.
- Andy Horner, Beth Schwartz and Troy Washington recently met with McGohan Brabender and were encouraged with the conversations regarding the renewal of both the medical and pharmacy benefit plans for the next enrollment period. The Council will have a full, detailed discussion in the next few meetings in preparation for fall open enrollment period.
- There was a short discussion regarding the new proposed overtime rules through the Department of Labor. The financial impact that the new proposed rules will have to be a budget consideration. To date there is not enough information on proposed rules to determine the total impact.

August 11, 2015

- Susan Sexton shared the June claims history which depicted year to date averages were trending slightly lower than 2014 probably in part due to the increase in stop loss insurance that we elected for this year.
- Troy Washington shared the restructured Human Resources organizational chart with the council members.
- Kathy Maynard from McGohan Brabender provided a review of the renewal process, plan utilization, plan design, and emerging trends.
- Beth Schwartz updated the HRAC that our long term care insurance enrollment will have a December 1st go-live date with new provider.
- Beth Schwartz explained the open enrollment process this year will be on-line with the same deadlines as in years past with a single sign on LDAP password. Employees will be able to enroll on-line for health care plans and flex spending with a confirmation of election during the open enrollment period.

September 15, 2015

- A demonstration of the new benefits enrollment portal was provided
- Susan Sexton shared the August claims history which illustrated year to date averages were trending slightly over 2014 expenses. The cumulative total costs per month were trending comparable to 2014.

- The proposed increase in the 2016 employee contributions for health care was discussed.

October 12, 2015

- The work of the Retirement Plan Committee's work on recordkeeping consolidation was discussed.
- Susan Sexton shared the September claims history. The past four months in 2015 have been very stable.
- Troy Washington explained a change in practice with the HAY nonexempt classified review process. The review process has been adjusted to a just in time review process.
- Beth Schwartz updated the Council about this year's open enrollment communication process.
- Beth Schwartz updated the Council on new wellness initiatives.

December 14, 2015

- Susan Sexton shared the October and November 2015 health claim history.
- Troy Washington reported on the formation of a new Presidential task force that will work to develop a set of recommendations for consideration that could be implemented as early as the 2017 plan year for health care, to aid the University and its employees in stemming the growth in health care costs. The task force will be comprised of twelve to fifteen members of the community, including a broad cross section of faculty and staff, as well as members of the Board of Trustees. The work of the task force will commence in January and conclude in the spring of 2016.
- Troy Washington shared the 2016-17 proposed holiday calendars with the HRAC members.
- Beth Schwartz requested feedback about the online open enrollment process implementation.
- Theresa Gilbert reported on the results from the 2015 Health evaluations.

February 10, 2016

- Susan Sexton shared the December 2015 health claim history. Overall claims came in below what was originally projected, with 2015 overall health care and related costs ending up approximately \$500,000 higher than 2014.
- Troy Washington detailed the composition of the Presidential Healthcare Task Force. The composition of the Task Force includes three HRAC members.
- Troy updated the HRAC on new staff and relocation plans for the Office of Human Resources. The entire Office of Human Resources staff will be relocating to the third floor of St. Mary's Hall in two stages. There will also be several other departments relocating in St. Mary's Hall in an effort to provide student services on the first floor.
- Troy announced that faculty and staff would be asked to participate in a ModernThink Great Colleges survey beginning March 8, 2016 and concluding on March 22.
- Troy announced that new lactation space, to be located on the second floor of Fitz Hall should be completed within the next two months, and additional

space will be added in both St. Mary's Hall and Alumni Hall, as renovations are completed in those buildings.

Respectfully submitted by Emily Hicks