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Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
March 18, 2011; 9 a.m.
St. Mary’s Hall Room 113A

Present: Paul Benson, Corinne Daprano, George Doyle, Heidi Gauder, Antonio Mari, Leno Pedrotti, Carolyn Roecker Phelps, Joseph Saliba, Rebecca Wells

Absent: Judith Huacuja, Andrea Seielstad, Katie Trempe

Guests: Brad Duncan, James Farrelly

Opening Meditation: Carolyn Roecker Phelps opened the meeting with meditation

ECAS Secretary Corinne Daprano presided over the meeting.

Minutes: The minutes of the March 11 meeting were approved.

Announcements
The next meeting of the Academic Senate is scheduled for March 18, 2011, in the KU Ballroom at 3:00pm.

R. Wells announced that, at the March 18 meeting of the full Academic Senate, she would report the progress made by the Faculty Affairs Committee on issues related to intellectual property and student evaluation of instruction.

New Business
Graduate Faculty Status. Brad Duncan, Associate Dean of Graduate, Professional, & Continuing Education (GPCE), presented a proposal entitled “Revised Criteria and Application Process for the Granting of Graduate Faculty Status”. The proposal is submitted by the office of Graduate, Professional & Continuing Education and the University of Dayton Graduate Leadership Council.

B. Duncan began by indicating that the Office of GPCE is undergoing a review of policies and procedures and the aforementioned proposal may be but the first of a number of proposals to be brought to the Academic Senate from the Office of GPCE.

B. Duncan introduced the proposal entitled “Revised Criteria and Application Process for the Granting of Graduate Faculty Status” by reviewing the current policy governing Graduate Faculty Status (GFS). According to the background section of the proposal:

“Appointment to the Graduate Faculty is made by the now Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate, Professional & Continuing Education (GPCE), based upon recommendations from a faculty member’s Department Chair or Program Director, unit level academic Dean and the Graduate Leadership Council (GLC). The current ‘criteria’ (see document #9596-17, attached dated February 9, 1973) are, however, commonly ignored when reviewing an applicant for GFS [2,3]. This has been done to the point of compromising the meaningfulness of the criteria, and thus the overall GFS approval process.”

B. Duncan noted that the only benefit to faculty for having GFS is in being allowed to chair Master’s theses and doctoral advisory committees. He then reviewed the remaining material.
contained in the background section of the proposal. He went on to detail the proposal itself – the key element of which is

1) As of the date on which this proposal receives final Senate approval, all tenured or tenure-track faculty members with rank of Assistant Professor or higher, who also hold a Ph.D., or equivalent, shall become members of the Graduate Faculty, retroactively. In the future, any person holding a Ph.D., or equivalent, who is hired into a tenured or tenure-track faculty position, becomes a member of the Graduate Faculty as of the date of hire (see exceptions below). The potential to serve as the chair of a master’s thesis or doctoral advisory committee should then be examined during the interview process.

B. Duncan summarized the other 7 itemized elements in the proposal and the rationale for the proposal. Further, he noted that the framers of the proposal had discussed and rejected a proposal to eliminate Graduate Faculty Status altogether. He stated that, in his opinion, a persuasive argument for keeping some form of GFS is that it provides a mechanism for allowing people who are not tenured or tenure-track faculty members to obtain GFS status.

C Roecker Phelps stated that she was in favor of the proposal but had some suggestions. She suggested that item 6) in Section 2.0 of the proposal should follow item 3) of that section. Also, she suggested that items 5), 7), and 8) of Section 2.0 should be grouped together under a separate subheading since items 1)-3) and 6) deal with obtaining GFS, and 5), 7), and 8) deal with removal or denial of GFS. There was general agreement that this should be done.

G. Doyle inquired about items 4) and 8) of Section 2.0. Item 4) indicates that GFS is not available to instructors and item 8) states that GFS is removed when a faculty member retires or leaves the university. G. Doyle queried whether this would remove GFS from some who already have it or deny GFS to some who should have it. B. Duncan noted that retiring faculty would regain GFS if they were granted Emeritus/Emerita faculty status and could otherwise apply for GFS under provision 8) of item 3) in Section 2.0.

Suggestions were made that item 4), in which GFS status is made unavailable to instructors, should be removed so that instructors could apply for GFS status under provision 8) of item 3) in Section 2.0. It was noted that the designation of instructor was to be discontinued.

J. Farrelly noted that issues surrounding GFS had a long sometimes contentious history at UD. He suggested that it might, after all, be better to eliminate altogether the notion of GFS. B. Duncan reiterated his reasons for keeping GFS.

C. Daprano asked about the common practice regarding GFS at other Universities. There was no definitive answer to that query.

L. Pedrotti wondered if having a designation of GFS mattered to accrediting agencies. R. Wells replied that having such a designation did matter for accreditation in the School of Business Administration.

B. Duncan agreed to make corrections and clarifications and forward the proposal to J. Huacuja and R. Wells. He will then present the document to FAC at their March 25 meeting. It may be possible to bring the proposal to the April 15 Academic Senate meeting.
Consultative Process. Due to travel by Provost Saliba for the next two weeks, full discussion of the consultative process will be postponed; however, there was discussion regarding the general concerns and points that needed to be addressed. J. Farrelly pointed out instances in which ECAS was not consulted prior to administrative appointments, contrary to the Senate Constitution. There was discussion on the definition of promotion and what constitutes a promotion. It was decided that the discussion on consultation should address the following: what are ECAS expectations for consultation; what is the process for consultation; what structures need to be in place that for allow for appropriate consultation.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15am

Respectfully submitted by Leno Pedrotti, Carolyn Phelps, and Corinne Daprano