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Approved Minutes
Meeting of the University of Dayton Academic Senate
September 14, 2018
Kennedy Union Ballroom, 3:30-5:30 p.m.
Corinne Daprano, President


Absent: Sanders Chang, Rowen Gray, Laura Leming, Andrew Strauss, John White

Guests: Chris Agnew, Amy Anderson, Susan Brown, Amy Christopher, Tyler Dunham, Jim Farrelly, Morgan Klutho, Sarah Kuhns, Abigail Lieser, Carolyn Phelps, Tiffany Taylor Smith, Eric F. Spina, Daniel Thompson, Kim Trick, Joe Valenzano, David Wright

1. Opening Prayer/Meditation: Leslie Picca
2. Minutes of 27 April 2018
   a. Approved without objection
3. Committee reports (reports are appended)
   a. APC – Anne Crecelius
   b. FAC – Mark Jacobs
   c. SAPC – Todd Smith
   d. ECAS – Corinne Daprano
4. UDCI Report presented by Anne Crecelius (report is appended). Discussion followed.
5. Office of Diversity and Inclusion presentation by Tiffany Taylor Smith (presentation is appended). Discussion followed.
6. Chaminade Hall Vision Committee update presented by Todd Smith (presentation is appended). Discussion followed.
Appendices

3a: Academic Policies Committee Report
14 September 2018
Submitted by Anne Crecelius, chair

APC has met two times so far this semester (Thursdays at 9:30 am in Fall Semester in SM 113B).

Past Year Activity and Charge
a. We received an update from Assistant Provost Michelle Pautz on CAP and the 4 year review process.
b. We reviewed the year end report from AY 17-18, the charge from ECAS regarding completing a report on Actions Pertaining to Academic Programs, and the constitution of a Task Force on Transfer Credit.
c. We reviewed and prepared a presentation of the China Institute Report that was submitted in April 2018 and was postponed to this Academic Senate meeting.

Our next meeting is Thursday, September 20th at 9:30-10:30 in SM 113B.

3b: Faculty Affairs Committee Report
14 September 2018
Submitted by Mark Jacobs, chair

The FAC received a charge to evaluate edits to the faculty handbook. These edits pertain to updates in titles, committee names, grammatical issues, and other minor items. None of the edits are intended to modify the substance of the document in any meaningful way.

A second portion of the charge is to insert language into section 4 part 8 that clarifies the definition of tenure and tenure track faculty.

The committee has begun its work and is expected to resolve this charge by the 1st of January.

3c: Student Academic Policies Committee Report
14 September 2018
Submitted by Todd Smith, chair

SAPC has not yet met this academic year; its first meeting will be Tuesday, September 18th at 12:30pm in SM 113A.
SAPC will continue work on its charge to investigate the academic honor code and student academic misconduct.

3d: Executive Committee of the Academic Senate Report  
14 September 2018  
Submitted by Corinne Daprano, chair

ECAS is meeting this semester on Fridays from 9:00-10:30am in SM 113B. We have been working on creating and reviewing several charges to the standing committees. We also had a discussion recently with President Eric Spina about various university initiatives. Senators should have received an invitation to the Board of Trustees Installation. The Installation will occur on Wednesday, October 17 at 4:30 pm in Sears Recital Hall. ECAS is also planning to co-sponsor with Student Development two Campus Dialogue forums – one in the Fall and one during the Spring semester. The topics will include a discussion of Student Mental Health (Fall 2018) and the other around the topic of Campus Safety and Security (Spring 2019).
Overview

On August 25, 2017 the Academic Policies Committee (APC) received a charge from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (ECAS) to: “investigate the structures, practices and experience of faculty at UDCI.” Specifically, the charge stated that “There are a number of questions faculty have regarding the practices at UDCI in terms of its implementation of our academic mission.”

Process

The committee began its work in January 2018. Prior to this, preliminary information was gathered from an open informational session hosted by Terence Lau, Executive Director of Academic and Corporate Relations at the China Institute (CI) in September 2017. Initial discussions within the committee explored the specific questions raised in the charge from ECAS, which included:

(1) What is the faculty experience at UDCI?
(2) What is the governance structure at UDCI?
(3) How are courses assigned and overseen at UDCI?
(4) What is the process by which one can teach at UDCI?
(5) What are the relevant connections to main campus at UDCI?
(6) How is the academic mission supported/not supported at UDCI?
(7) What are the goals and overall strategy for UDCI?

Following internal discussions, a number of actions were taken by the committee to gather information from various individuals and groups. To begin, the committee reviewed the presentation provided from Terence Lau and the public information on the China Institute available via the internet. In addition, the committee sent a request for information (via email) to Terence Lau and received written responses. Provost Paul Benson attended
an APC meeting in February 2018 to provide background and information on CI and answer questions from the committee. Based upon the questions provided from ECAS and initial conversations, the committee drafted a brief survey instrument to obtain direct, anonymous input from full-time faculty who had taught at CI within the past 4 years. Additional information was solicited from Jon Hess, Associate Dean in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), who is the CAS liaison, as well as from department chairs in the School of Business Administration (SBA).

Findings

Background of China Institute

Based primarily on the conversation with Provost Benson, we provide a brief background of CI. While UD was invited to engage in education in China in 2005/2006, it declined. But a few years later the university reversed course, opening a building in Suzhou in 2012. It was a low cost investment, given that the building was a gift and the Chinese government reimburses 50% of the operating funds coming from UD. Moreover, it has given UD proximity to a number of elite institutions (e.g., Oxford) in Suzhou Industrial Park.

UD was invited to Suzhou Industrial Park with the notion of focusing on materials science/engineering research. But that did not work out, because of both resource limits and the constraints coming from Department of Defense regarding contract research. So UD has instead pursued other functions, as detailed below.

As far as enrollment at CI is concerned, there have been 378 students (total, from UD and elsewhere) between the summer of 2013 and the fall of 2017. This averages to 29 students per term -- and there is no noticeable trend in student enrollment.

Goals and Strategy of CI

Provost Dr. Paul Benson described CI as a “startup enterprise” and that it can be helpful to look at all activities at CI from that point of view. In other words, the goals and strategies of CI are dynamic, and may be best understood as largely opportunistic. Dedicated strategic planning has not been done for CI nor is it planned for the near future. Nonetheless, APC feels it is prudent to
ensure that all the employed structures and practices at CI are reflective of the values exemplified at the University of Dayton main campus since any activities at CI are delivered in the name of UD.

Current Functions and Aims

Based primarily on the conversation with Provost Benson, it is our understanding that the work of the China Institute is currently focused around three goals that aim to benefit the University of Dayton. In order to be fiscally diverse and leverage all aspects of the CI, these multiple goals have arisen. Importantly, the programs, offerings, and goals of CI are still evolving.

Firstly, CI engages in providing education abroad opportunities for UD students. Multiple programs throughout the year are offered in an attempt to provide students opportunities to study abroad while still earning UD credits.

Secondly, CI attempts to assist in overall UD recruitment efforts in a number of ways. By having a physical presence in China, CI aims to raise UD’s visibility to Chinese nationals and recruit them to study either at CI or in Dayton at UD. UD’s recent partnership with Shorelight and the creation of UDayton Global will attempt to broaden recruitment efforts via CI.

Thirdly, CI aims to develop and maintain strong corporate partnerships for UD. Given the location of CI in the Suzhou Industrial Park, it is well positioned geographically to support these types of partnerships. In fact, Provost Benson reported that certain corporations, such as Eli Lilly, would actually prefer to partner with UD in China rather than in the States.

A variety of offerings are currently in place at CI in order to support these multiple goals of CI. To support study abroad, UD courses are offered during 14 week fall (August-November) or spring (January-April) semesters, where students take 12-18 credit hours. These offerings are at an all-inclusive program cost for students. Summer offerings (mid-May to late June) are 6 weeks in duration and students take 6 credit hours. Intersession programs are also available, lasting 2 weeks from late December to mid-January, with students taking one, 3-credit hour course. In addition, models of CI serving as a host site for faculty-led study abroad programs administered through the Center for International Programs are also offered. One effort to increase the
The draw of CI as a study abroad option has been the offering of a 12 credit hour minor, that can only be completed at CI, titled “Studies in Design and Entrepreneurship in China”. The courses currently offered at CI are from the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business Administration and the School of Engineering. The majority of courses are offered in areas such as the arts, business, engineering, humanities, natural sciences and social sciences.

In addition to the offerings that target UD students interested in education abroad, course and program offerings aim to provide financial diversification as well as aid in recruitment. A partnership has emerged with Northeastern University to support their NU Bound program. In this program, academically qualified international students spend their first year of study at CI prior to transferring to the NU Boston campus. Approximately 30 students participate in this program at CI and courses are offered that satisfy the needs of these students. Additional diversification of student enrollment at CI comes from study abroad partnerships with Canisius College and the University of Central Florida. To promote recruitment of Chinese nationals, the B.E.S.T. program targets high schoolers with aims to jumpstart a bachelor’s education (at UD in Dayton or elsewhere in the US) whereas the MFIN China Start program targets graduates from Chinese undergraduate programs to pursue and complete a Masters degree at UD.

Future Potentials

One challenge facing UD and CI is how we use the Institute to its fullest capacity. At full capacity, the CI facilities can accommodate about 300 students, with accompanying faculty and staff. Currently, usage is well below that capacity. Usage at or near capacity is important, since it allows us to distribute the costs of operations across the maximum number of courses and learning opportunities, thereby lowering the cost to any single student. This creates a chicken-and-egg challenge to UD: by increasing the use of CI we lower the cost of a China experience for every student; yet, we must find ways to lower the cost to make such experiences attractive to UD students.

Two non-exclusive approaches exist to increase usage of the China Institute. The first approach is to increase the number of UD students taking advantage of the offerings and potential offerings of the CI. These could be both
“outbound” students (US students looking for a globalizing experience) and “inbound” students (Chinese students looking for a route to a US university). Examples of the former are current course offerings, such as semester, summer or intersession courses. At the horizon would be CI learning embedded in current degree programs (e.g., A&S International Studies or SBA International Business students required to spend a semester at CI as partial fulfillment of their degree program). Examples of the latter would include the “China Start” pathway for students in the Master of Finance degree program. This program offers entry into the MFin for Chinese students, beginning their degree at CI. Upon successful completion of sufficient credits, students are fully admitted into the program and visa paperwork is issued. In both cases, growth plans would need to be accompanied by a strategy that dedicates resources to the goals, has clearly defined curricular parameters and assurance of learning outcomes in place.

The second alternative is to partner with other US universities seeking a front door in China. Current examples of this include Northeastern University’s NU Bound program, as well as study abroad opportunities for University of Central Florida business students. We have networks among Catholic universities and within the Shorelight partnership that could be tapped for such arrangements. These partnerships come with resource questions – do we provide a space or a higher level of service (e.g., a standard portfolio of classes that UD staffs)?

According to Provost Benson, the ideal mix of students at CI could be 15% current UD students, 25% US students from other universities, and 60% Chinese (or other non-US) students seeking access to US educational opportunities. This mix would allow for sufficient global experiences for UD and other American students studying at CI and not create a “UD bubble”.

Governance Structure

CI is administratively located directly under the Provost’s office. The involvement of Enrollment Management is in line with the strategic vision of CI, which in part is to increase UD’s visibility in China for better recruitment of Chinese students. The VP for EM reports to the Provost (as does Diversity/Inclusion and Research VPs). As of the writing of this report, Terence Lau is in a temporary 1 year position, which was created in response to a need for adequate academic policies and procedures, as well as
providing consistent administrative support for UD faculty teaching at CI, particularly in anticipation of other partnerships. It is currently unclear what the future of this position will be. The structure of CI also includes a VP for Student Development, Dean of Students, as well as support staff.

UD (and CI) are not authorized by the Chinese government to offer degrees in China. All courses taught at CI are UD courses overseen by Dean’s offices on the Dayton campus. They are taught by approved UD faculty, including non-tenure line faculty as well as part-time adjunct faculty. Which courses are offered at CI is determined by the Dean’s offices based on what courses are needed and who can teach there. The Provost’s office is committed to provide the resources to cover faculty travel, housing, compensation, etc. Full-time faculty appointment exclusively at CI has occurred at least once, and may continue to occur in the future.

Course Selection, Assignment, Supervision and Review

The committee gathered information about the university’s credit courses offered at CI – how are they selected, how are instructors chosen (fulltime UD faculty and/or adjuncts – some local Chinese), and how are such course offerings reviewed to assure that academic quality is maintained?

- These issues were addressed in questions we posed to Provost Benson, CAS Associate Dean Hess, and Terence Lau.
- We received input from the faculty survey concerning instructor selection, academic preparation of students, and academic rigor of course delivery.
- In addition, we received information from selected department chairs.

The general response we received is that the process of course selection, faculty assignment, and overview for academic quality is similar but not identical to that done for courses offered on-campus. Faculty express interest to Associate Deans (who are working with CI individuals). If courses that are needed or desired have no UD faculty expressing interest, Associate Deans and others seek adjuncts. It is unclear whether appropriate departments are involved in such adjunct decisions – the committee found evidence that this is not always the case. Beginning only in 2017-18, SET is performed for all courses and results are provided. It is unclear whether the SET results are provided to all appropriate department chairs.

A key difference in this process, however, is that Associate Deans (working
with CI's Terence Lau) appear to be the focal point for course and instructor selection and academic quality monitoring – as opposed to the process on campus in which academic chairs serve as this focal point. We found some evidence from department chairs that they are not involved in all course and instructor selection nor are they always receiving feedback (SET and other) after course delivery.

It is concerning if UD courses are offered anywhere without the appropriate academic department’s active involvement in the entire lifecycle of the course (e.g. faculty selection, course learning objectives, delivery, and assurance of continuing academic quality). Such involvement is the core of maintaining academic quality of UD’s courses and programs.

We also understand that Professor Terence Lau’s tenure and position at CI is only for this 2017-18 academic year. He is the one tenured faculty member whose partial focus is on the quality of the academic offerings.

Faculty Experience

A non-scientific survey was sent to thirty full-time faculty members (two were excluded who are no longer at UD) who had previously taught at the CI. The list was provided by Sean McCarthy, Associate Director of International Initiatives, in consultation with Jia Jia Wei, Director of International Initiatives and Executive Director of the China Institute. In total twenty faculty members responded (63% response rate). In the majority of the cases (75%) the faculty member requested to teach at CI, with the remainder being either the chair or dean asking. 30% of the responding faculty taught at CI during a spring semester, 25% in an intercession, 15% during a fall and 40% for a summer semester. 30% taught a course developed specifically for CI whereas 70% delivered a course that is regularly offered on campus in Dayton. For 47% of the faculty members the students in their class were mostly from UD, while 11% had mostly native Chinese students, and no one had mostly American students not from the University of Dayton. 42% had a mix of all the above mentioned student populations.

When asked on a scale of 1 to 5, how connected they felt to main campus while at CI, 40% answered 3 while 25% said 5, 5% said 4, 10% answered 2 and 20% replied 1. Using the same scale while asking to evaluate the academic rigor of the course they taught at CI, relative to when they taught
that course on main campus, the responses were 16% 5, 32% 4, 37% 3, 10% 2, and 5% 1. Thus, 85% felt the academic quality is not a concern at CI. When asked to evaluate the English language skills of the majority of the students in their class on a scale of 1 to 5, 16% responded 5, 42% 4, 26% 3, 11% 2, and 5% 1. So only 16% felt a concern about the English ability of the majority of their students. If faculty encountered an academic problem (e.g. student behavior, academic integrity, etc) in their class while at CI (only 40% did), the majority of them (75%) felt that there was adequate oversight and support at CI to deal with the problem. The last question asked was: “The mission of UD is: We are a diverse community committed, in the Marianist tradition, to educating the whole person and linking learning and scholarship with leadership and service. In your opinion, to what extent does CI contribute to this mission”? The overwhelming majority rated this as four (25%) or five (60%) out of five, while only 15% replied two out of five.

Some of the additional comments that were provided at the end of the survey were as follows:

- “This is a worthwhile endeavor.”
- “When I taught at CI, I could easily take students to corporate visits. Students could see how American businesses such as Microsoft, IBM operate in China and how they are different from Chinese businesses such as Alibaba, Huawei, Hikvision, and Lenovo.”
- “The field trips are extremely valuable.”
- “While CI not only serves as a great educational opportunity for our students, it also serves as a great branding opportunity for the university as a whole. Having the facility and the staff on the ground in Suzhou can be a significant differentiator.”
- “The course I taught at the China Institute was a course that is regularly offered on campus in Dayton; but I have fully utilized the CI location to provide experiential learning opportunities for my students. For example, we visited China Finance Museum in Shanghai and Fund Museum in Suzhou; we traded stocks through a "simulated portfolio account" in both China and US. Regarding the academic rigor of the course I taught at CI, I maintain the same level of rigor relative to when I have taught that course on main campus. More importantly, I have witnessed close interaction between Chinese and non-Chinese students both in and outside of classroom at CI.”
But there were also more cautionary tales:

- “The administrative and enrollment folks involved in recruiting students put so much pressure on the dollar value, that students were pressured to take at least as high (or higher) course load than they would at the main campus for a summer session. Then those admin / enroll folks told me to lighten the course content to make the students happy, and one even wanted to discuss homework with me. I had already trimmed the content by 1/4 compared to main campus. What’s the point of going to China if you push the students into the classroom instead of OUT of the classroom?”

- “In general it was an unpleasant experience.”

- “My experience teaching at the CI was very positive, but it was difficult to demand the same level of work from students given that they were traveling on weekends and taking 9 or more credits over a six week period.”

- While the staff in Suzhou are very eager to please, and the facility is quite nice as a physical structure (...), my feeling is that it is regrettable that we have committed to a 'building' rather than a 'program.' It is critical in this day and age that students learn about China, but I don’t believe Suzhou is a good fit for our students. It would be far better to provide programming in the form of faculty-led study/travel programs or develop relationships with Chinese universities. As it is, our students are shuttled from dorms--unoccupied by others or occupied by older, foreign but not Chinese students--to air-conditioned classrooms (close to Starbucks and Subway and surrounded by biotech factories) and back again for classes that often don’t even incorporate any content specific to China. The few field trips (within and outside Suzhou) are not 'academically' oriented, or chosen by the relevant faculty to speak to their course content; instead, they seem to be random acts of 'edu-tourism' (...) I’d really like the University community to reconsider this adventure....”

Final Comments and Recommendations

Most of the parties with the closest involvement with CI were consulted in the process of creating this report, including the current CI Director of Academic and Corporate Relations, the CAS Associate Dean for Faculty Scholarship, Internationalization and Inclusive Excellence, and the Provost.
However, it is important to note that the consultative process was not exhaustive, and that in some ways those consulted were a sample of convenience, especially with regards to surveying faculty who have taught at CI and gathering input from academic administrators.

Based on these consultations as well as the survey responses of faculty members who have taught at CI, the APC makes the following recommendations:

- UD should clarify the mission of CI, particularly how it fits into the newly developed Vision for the University of Dayton.
- UD should continue to explore options and pursue opportunities for more fully utilizing CI.
- For any UD course offerings at CI, we must maintain academic standards and quality at the same level as we do for on-campus courses. To this end, we recommend that department chairs be fully involved in scheduling, selecting faculty (especially adjuncts), hiring of faculty who are intended to teach at CI, assuring appropriate course objectives, ensuring any special course resources or training are provided, and reviewing student feedback as well as assessment of learning after each delivery.
  - With regards to this latter point, our consultations and discussion have highlighted that as an institution we may not currently have the wherewithal to appropriately evaluate the type of learning that takes place in this type of unique academic experience.
- Given that the goals and strategies of CI are dynamic and that its governance structure and the delivery of UD courses at CI are unique, we recommend that ECAS be updated annually regarding CI. Said updates should include, but not be limited to, a summary of course offerings, faculty and departments involved, the composition of students, and the goals and strategies of CI.

APC Membership

Chair: Anne Crecelius (SEHS), Lee Dixon (CAS-SS), Jim Dunne (SBA), Jason Pierce (CAS Dean), Bill Trollinger (CAS-HUM), Shuang-ye Wu (CAS-NS), Markus Rumpfkeil* (SoE), John Mittelstaedt (SBA Dean), Deb Bickford (ex officio) *Philip Appiah-Kubi filled this role during Fall 2017 while Rumpfkeil was on sabbatical
1 Prior to 2017, the formal name was University of Dayton China Institute. A rebranding occurred and the preferred name is now “China Institute.”

2 https://udayton.edu/china_institute/,
   https://udayton.edu/china_institute/overview.php

3 A list of these faculty members was obtained from Sean McCarthy, Associate Director of International Initiatives.

4 In School of Engineering and School of Business Administration, Scott Segalewitz and Randy Sparks fill this role, respectively.

5 https://www.northeastern.edu/admissions/academics/specialized-entry/nu-bound-china/

6 https://www.canisius.edu/study-abroad-locations-1


8 https://udayton.edu/china_institute/udci_best/index.php

9 https://udayton.edu/china_institute/MFIN_china_start/index.php
5: Presentation by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion

Diversity and Inclusion

Tiffany Taylor Smith, Executive Director
Diversity and Inclusion

President's Diversity & Inclusion Assessment Task Force
2018-2019

- Diversity Definitions Labs Aug. 29-30
- Diversity Mapping Report Sept. 10-11
- AIM4 Community Excellence Listening Sessions Sept. 11
- AIM4 Community Excellence Survey Launch Sept. 24
- AIM4 Community Excellence Survey Closes Oct. 31
- Task Force Final Report April 2019
Task Force Deliverables

- Comprehensive Framework for Strategic Plan for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- Recommendation for a Permanent DE&I Committee/Council
- Definitions for Core Terms Informing the Work to Advance Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at UD

Defining our Terms

Through the Lens of Our Catholic and Marianist Mission

- Diversity
- Equity
- Inclusion
- Multicultural
- Global
- Interfaith
- Inclusive Excellence
- Intercultural/Intergroup Competency
- Social Justice
- Multifaith
Guest Resident Scholar

DENA SAMUELS
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17
7 P.M., KENNEDY UNION BALLROOM
Open to the public.

Dr. Samuels is a culturally inclusive mindful leadership coach and presenter, and author of The Culturally Inclusive Educator: Preparing for a Multicultural World and The Mindfulness Effect.

A special thank you to the following co-sponsors: Athletics, Center for International Programs, College of Arts and Sciences, Equity Compliance Office, Office of Assessment and Planning, College of Education and Human Development, College of Information and Computer Sciences, College of Literature, Arts, and Sciences, College of Public Policy, College of Social Work, College of Engineering, Student Development, Student Government Association, University Libraries, University of Dayton Research Institute, Women’s Center.
Chaminade Hall Visioning

September 2018

Chaminade Hall Visioning Committee

Corrine Daprano and Todd Smith (Academic Senate), Amy Lopez-Matthews and Steve Herndon (student development), Deb Bickford (academic affairs), Rick Krysiak (facilities management and planning) and Scott Wilson (undergraduate student), Father James Fitz, S.M. (vice president for mission and rector), and David Wright (director of academic technology and curriculum innovation).

Committee Charge

Charge issued by President Eric F. Spina, Summer 2018, after initial consultation with senior leaders, Presidents Council and Educational Leadership Council:

• Develop a vision for Chaminade Hall that reflects the University’s values and its strategic needs in the accomplishment of our mission as a student-centered university.

• Consider carefully how best to derive optimal long-term value from the Chaminade Hall footprint and surrounding areas and what key program areas would both meet critical University needs and activate the space fully for the benefit of students, faculty, and staff.

i. The committee is encouraged to create opportunities for campus constituencies to provide input and then reflect on this input as it prepares and submits to the president a set of guiding principles for a follow-on committee that will engage more directly on tactical space program considerations.

ii. Complete work by November 1, 2018.
Photos of Chaminade Hall
Committee perspective sought on:

• Preservation of the Chaminade name and history.

• Prioritization of potential space allocation in support of the University’s overall strategic vision for student life, academic mission, scholarship, and community engagement.

Possible physical connections to Kennedy Union and Kennedy Union Plaza and options that might address the appearance of the receiving dock area.

Suggestions for maintaining the strong character of the existing courtyard to the north and west.

Blessed William Joseph Chaminade (1761-1850)

The sponsor of the University of Dayton, the Society of Mary, was founded by Blessed William Joseph Chaminade, a priest in the diocese of Bordeaux, France in 1817.

The Society of Mary, a community of priests and lay religious, is the male religious branch of the Marianist Family.

French Revolution forced the new sodality to go underground.

Society of Mary emerged as a community of mutual support and Christian outreach that attracted all sectors of society.

Chaminade realized the importance of transforming society through education.
Chaminade Hall - History

Built in 1904, and occupied in 1905.

Originally housed dormitory, infirmary, classrooms, club room, game room and dining facilities.

At various times, the building housed a library, study hall, offices, and classrooms for multiple disciplines.

Arcade connected Chaminade Hall to St. Mary’s from 1919 to 2014.

Department of Education (later, School of Education and Health Sciences) housed 1940’s-2014.

Chaminade Hall closed four years ago because it did not meet safety standards, including fire codes and ADA accessibility standards that made the building unsafe and unusable. Board of Trustees recommended a shuttering of building until these concerns could be met.
**Current Perspective on Renovate vs. Rebuild**

Committee has toured building, held meetings during summer and fall, heard input from Facilities Management, and analyzed a report from external architectural consultant.

At the present moment, the Committee tentatively recommends tearing down the present structure and building a new Chaminade Hall building on the present site.

Our plan is to share this tentative recommendation with the campus for input, and then move to the significant issues relative to our charge of crafting guiding principles and a vision for future use of the space.

**Reasons for the committee’s preliminary recommendation:**

- **Building a new structure:**
  
  - Would be significantly cheaper than renovation. ($1M alone would be needed to shore-up the old walls to renovate.)
  
  - Provides more space on the same footprint.

- Chaminade Hall is not one of the iconic buildings on the core of the campus (e.g. like the Chapel of the Immaculate Conception, St. Mary’s Hall, St. Joseph’s Hall, Zehler Hall, and Liberty Hall).

- Last major renovation (1960’s) paid little attention to the original architectural elements. Little compelling original architecture remains.

- Committee has identified aspects and artifacts from present structure that could be used in a new Chaminade Hall.

- Potential of space between KU and Chaminade is great. Rebuilding would provide opportunity to make that space useful and more attractive (e.g. receiving dock and dumpsters). If the current structure were kept, connecting the two buildings would need substantial ramping.
Seeking your feedback...

• What aspects of the current Chaminade Hall building should be preserved or recognized? Why?

• What aspects of the surroundings to the current Chaminade Hall building should be preserved or recognized? Why?

• What existing programs or services on the UD campus should be housed in a renovated or new Chaminade Hall? Why?

• What new programs or services should be housed in a renovated or new Chaminade Hall? Why?

• Please provide any additional information you think the Chaminade Hall Vision Committee should consider.
Forums – Engaging the Campus Community

• President’s Council – August 14, September 11, October 9
• Educational Leadership Council – August 20
• Academic Senate – September 14
• Open student forum (sponsored by SGA) – September 30
• Open faculty/staff sessions – LTC Studio (Ground floor of Roesch Library building):
  • Monday September 10, 9:05am-9:55am
  • Tuesday September 11, 11:00am-12:15pm
  • Wednesday September 12, 12:20pm-1:10pm
  • Thursday September 13, 11:00am-12:15pm
  • Friday September 14, 3:30pm-4:30pm
• Student Development leadership team – September 13
• Campus Ministry – September 13
• Alumni Association Leadership Conference – September 8

Online survey

https://goo.gl/Zv1zzj

This link is also found in an article found in Porches and Campus Report. The committee would like to receive input by Sunday, September 23.

If you have any questions, reflections, or suggestions, please do not hesitate to contact one of the chairs of the committee:

• Fr. Jim Fitz (jfitz1@udayton.edu)
• Dr. David Wright (dwright1@udayton.edu)