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Approved
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
September 15, 2011; 1:30pm
St. Mary’s Hall Room 113B

Present: Paul Benson, Corinne Daprano, George Doyle, Jesse Grewal, Emily Hicks, Jonathan Hess, Leno Pedrotti, Antonio Mari, Carolyn Phelps, Joseph Saliba, Andrea Seielstad, Rebecca Wells

Absent: None

Guests: James Farrelly

Opening Meditation: Antonio Mari opened the meeting with a meditation

Minutes: The minutes of the September 8, 2011 ECAS meeting were approved

Announcements: The next meeting of ECAS is September 22, 2011 from 1:30-2:30 p.m. in SM 113B.

J. Farrelly announced that the Faculty Board is looking at a November date for the fall faculty lunch meeting. The meeting will focus on the faculty workload issue currently being addressed by a FAC subcommittee.

Old business:
New communication technology in classroom. J. Hess consulted with David Wright about a possible university-wide policy regarding new communication technology in class. David agreed with ECAS that there is no need for a policy. The LTC will take under consideration ECAS’s request to address this topic when planning for next semester.

Faculty workload committee composition. J. Hess reviewed the request by Linda Hartley, chair of APC, to enlarge this sub-committee to include representation from all units. ECAS agreed that there doesn’t need to be additional representation on the committee but also agreed that FAC should set the size of their own sub-committee. Additionally, ECAS agreed that if the size of the committee increases then all the units should be represented.

J. Hess then reviewed and initiated a discussion of a proposal submitted by J. Farrelly, chair of the Faculty Board, regarding faculty workload guidelines (see attached). The proposal calls for a review of Senate DOC 95-01 – UD Faculty Workload Guidelines. ECAS suggested the following action steps for the sub-committee: 1) review the existing policy as articulated in Senate DOC 95-01; 2) conduct background research on the issue; 3) examine relevant guidelines at other peer institutions and the AAUP faculty workload guidelines; 4) formulate a list of recommendations regarding research, service, teaching, and administrative responsibilities for FT ranked faculty. J. Hess will consult with L. Hartley regarding these suggested action steps.

Academic misconduct policy. C. Phelps, chair of the APC, will send this policy to G. Doyle, chair of the SAPC, for review and comment by the SAPC before the document is sent to ECAS.

Statement on consultation J. Hess reviewed the issue of consultation as previously discussed by ECAS specifically, clarity of where consultation is needed and the relationship between faculty and the
administration. At the last ECAS meeting a two-step approach was suggested to resolve this issue. This approach would include: 1) the Senate and administration coming to a common understanding of what the Senate Constitution requires right now; and, 2) agreeing on the means of seeking more input or the dispersion of more information in the future. J. Hess reviewed a draft proposal to create an advisory council that would serve as a mechanism for facilitating effective communication. J. Farrelly created a draft of this idea for ECAS’s consideration (see attached).

ECAS discussion of the consultation issue ensued. R. Wells suggested that faculty and administrators need to determine what we mean by shared governance at UD. A. Seielstad suggested that there are several different interpretations of the Senate Constitution and instead of coming to some agreement around these interpretations it might make more sense to form a working group from the Senate to discuss how to move forward despite these differences. J. Farrelly suggested that if there are different interpretations of the Senate Constitution than the document may need to be revised and/or changed. He also suggested that the Senate needs a better understanding of how the Provost and President are interpreting the constitution. P. Benson suggested examining the consultation issue as it relates to specific appointments as well as creating an opportunity for face to face conversation with the Provost and President to build common ground. Provost Saliba expressed interest in a meeting with ECAS, himself, and the President. R. Wells volunteered to meet with A. Seielstad in order to draft a document that would specify the consultation issues most relevant to ECAS and the Senate and present the document to ECAS for discussion.

Creating committee to address Senate composition. This agenda item was put on hold for next week’s ECAS meeting.

UNRC issues. This agenda item was put on hold for next week’s ECAS meeting.

Standing committee work assignments. This is an updated list of the tasks assigned to the Senate’s standing committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>N/C</th>
<th>Prev</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Work due</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Offer final report</td>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP proposal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Review Appendix A</td>
<td>Oct. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of CAP dev</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Hear monthly reports</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Rec. on purpose of eval</td>
<td>Oct. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property rights</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Nov. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles for part-time faculty</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Nov. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy on emeritus status</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Nov. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Academic misconduct</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>SAPC</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*UNRC policy doc</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>Review final document</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee membership</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td>Complete the list</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty workload</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FAC/Ad hoc</td>
<td>Report and proposal</td>
<td>Mar. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Consultation issue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ECAS</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks completed</strong></td>
<td>N/C</td>
<td>Prev</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Work due</td>
<td>Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP&amp;CC voting rights</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>Offer recommendation</td>
<td>Aug. 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano
Title: Implementation of University Faculty Workload Guidelines

Submitted by: Faculty Board

Date:

Action: Legislative

Reference: Senate Document 95-01 http://www.udayton.edu/provost/#7
or http://academic.udayton.edu/senate/%20documents/Documents.htm

Rationale:

When the Academic Senate passed its University of Dayton Faculty Workload Guidelines document (95-01) in 1995, the Provost and President of the Academic Senate at the time, Father Heft, accepted the "workload document as an administrative guideline to inform the decisions of Deans and Department Chairperson who have been asked to develop specific workload policies for their respective units that are consonant with the general spirit of this workload document." He also indicated that "this policy will be reviewed in three years."

There is no evidence to indicate that the review ever took place, but Deans and Department Chairpersons did discuss and frame workload guidelines following the passage of Senate document 95-01, and records indicate that Associate Provosts John Geiger (who eventually became Provost in 1997) and Pat Palermo approved the guidelines proposed by the units and departments of the University.

When Fred Pestello replaced John Geiger as Provost in 2001, he asked the newly hired Associate Provost for Academic and Administrative Affairs, Joe Untener, to head a Provost Council Committee on the topic of Faculty Workload. Initially, Joe reports, "one of my main objectives was to simply shine a light on it. I was amazed at how opaque all of that really was. Deans knew almost nothing of the chair's decisions or lack thereof. The provost's office, of course, knew even less. Interestingly, when I started making the teaching assignments more public, things started happening. When I included class size and then even class times, more things became apparent."

Other obligations for Associate Provost Untener in the area of University reaccreditation prohibited the formation of a working Provost Council committee on workload, so the topic was put on hold and the analysis and review of Senate document 95-01 has yet to take place. It is now seventeen years since the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate (FACAS) began work on Senate document 95-01, and FACAS should take the initiative to analyze and review the Faculty Workload Guidelines. Recent criticism both inside and outside the Academy about faculty workload continues to raise questions about what faculty do, how much they actually teach, and the consistency of teaching assignments in various disciplines throughout a university. The "Four Principles" outlined in Senate document 95-01 certainly deserve a second look at this time, and the opaqueness cited by Joe Untener warrants the transparency of a fresh and open review.
The University of Dayton
Councils, Committees, and Boards

Council: **Strategic Planning Advisory Council** [working title]

**Purpose:** To serve as a consulting body to ensure that consultation and an exchange of information between the Academic Senate (AS) and the Administration takes place at regular intervals as part of University strategic planning and executive decision-making. This interaction will permit the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (ECAS) and the faculty constituencies it represents “to propose or comment upon policies which are other than academic and educational.” (See *Constitution of the Academic Senate*, Article II.3.)

**Meetings:** At least one meeting each term in key planning times for the University, i.e., mid-October and mid-February.

**Membership Composition:** ECAS members, the President (Daniel J. Curran), Senior Vice Presidents (Joseph E Saliba and Thomas E. Burkhardt), and other Vice Presidents as deemed necessary given the specific nature of the consultation and decision-making areas to be addressed.

**Academic Senate Constitutional Mandate:** In approving the *Constitution of the Academic Senate*, the University Faculty formally delegated to the Academic Senate its authority and responsibility under the *Constitution of the University of Dayton* (Article VII.2) in all matters except policies pertaining to academic freedom and tenure. Article II of the *Constitution of the Academic Senate* directly states that "The Academic Senate shall exercise Legislative Authority, Legislative Concurrence, and Consultation as defined in this Article."

**Legislative Authority** and **Legislative Concurrence** are clearly defined in the AS *Constitution*, but the definition of **Consultation** is limited to a fairly broad statement on the nature of communication expected between AS and the Administration and a partial list of issues requiring consultation, to wit, “Consultation is defined as an exchange of information with the Academic Senate for the purpose of permitting the Academic Senate to propose or comment upon policies which are other than academic and educational, including but not limited to the following:

a. University budget priorities (not budgets) and financial concerns such as financial crises and cutbacks
b. University admissions
c. Academic calendar
d. Size and composition of the student body
e. Faculty compensation and other conditions of service
f. Composition of University committees, councils, and boards
g. Selection, review and retention of the President and Vice Presidents
h. Selection, evaluation, and retention of Program Directors, Chairpersons, and Academic Deans
i. Scholarships and financial aid
j. Extracurricular academic matters (e.g., concerts, lectures, etc.)
k. Educational support programs

The President of the University accepts the responsibility to consult the Academic Senate on policies which are judged to have a significant impact upon the academic and educational development of the University." For its part, "The Academic Senate shall have the authority to effectuate the powers delegated to it under Article II, Section A of this Constitution."

[Need to define “policies” that “have a significant impact upon the academic and educational development of the University.” For example, what “exchange of information” with ECAS and AS should occur in advance of hiring, evaluating, and replacing the President and Vice Presidents, of hiring, evaluating, and replacing of program directors, chairpersons, and academic deans, of creating new Vice Presidential positions, of appointing an interim vice president to the vice president position without a search.]