University of Dayton

eCommons

Spring 3-15-2024

2024-03-15 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

MEETING MINUTES
FRIDAY, March 15, 2024
12:30-2pm , SM 113B

President: Erin O'Mara Kunz
Vice President: Allison Kinney
Secretary: Jon Fulkerson
Members: Jackie Arnold, Ali Carr-Chellman, Garrett Conti, Jen Dalton, Wiebke Diestelkamp, Jon Fulkerson, Tim Gabrielli, Kayla Harris, Lexie Kemble, Allison Kinney, Erin O'Mara Kunz, Joel Pruce (Faculty Board), Andrea Seielstad, Darlene Weaver

Present: Jackie Arnold, Ali Carr-Chellman, Garrett Conti, Jen Dalton, Wiebke Diestelkamp, Jon Fulkerson, Tim Gabrielli, Kayla Harris, Lexie Kemble, Allison Kinney, Erin O'Mara Kunz, Joel Pruce, Darlene Weaver

Absent: None

Guests: Andy Horner (Executive Vice President of Business and Administrative Services)

Opening

- Call to Order 12:32 (E. Kunz)
- Opening prayer/meditation (E. Kunz) [Prayer/meditation sign up here]
- **VOTE:** approval of minutes from March 8, 2024 meeting
  - o Approved by unanimous consent.

Announcements

- March 22, 2024: Academic Senate Meeting, 3:30-5:30pm, KU Ballroom
- March 25, 2024: No ELC, Easter Break
- March 29, 2024: No ECAS, Easter Break
- Five ECAS meetings remain in AY 23-24

Agenda Items

- **DISCUSSION AND VOTE:** March Academic Senate Meeting Agenda Draft
  - ○ Culturally Engaging Campus Environment survey results
  - ○ BlueSky update
  - ○ Discussion regarding whether we should include something related to co-majors given ECAS's recent approval of the neuroscience co-major.
    - ■ Comment: Propose that we state what we approved and discuss the campus-wide implications. Intent is to have a charge for APC next year.
      - ● What should be included in the materials distributed?
    - ■ Comment: Supports having the discussion because it provides transparency and consultation.
    - ■ Comment: This potentially conflicts with what was approved last week. Concerned about what happens next year if we create a campus-wide co-major policy.

- ■ Comment: Unlikely to get something very different next year. In the interest of letting this move forward, we want to have additional consultation next year for a campus-wide policy.
- ■ Question: What happens if there are future co-major proposals?
  - ● From a program in Arts & Sciences, they could move through.
  - ● Outside Arts & Sciences, it would require the unit to come up with a co-major proposal.
  - ● There is value in presenting options. Doesn't preclude other units from proposing something.
- ■ Decided to provide a brief overview of co-majors and open the floor for discussion at next meeting of the Academic Senate.
  - ○ *Motion to approve agenda for next meeting of the Academic Senate* (A. Kinney, W. Diestelkamp second)
    - ■ Vote: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstain.
    - ■ *Motion passed.*
- ● **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE:** APC's report, Consultation on the Revision to the Social Sciences CAP Requirement
  - ○ Discussion regarding what to do with the report from APC.
    - ■ APC approached their report as providing feedback. APC highlighted two concerns that must be addressed. Other items were just items to be ready to address in a proposal.
    - ■ APC does not believe it needs to see the changes to the proposal before moving forward assuming the Social Science Chairs opt to make their changes.
  - ○ Comment: Believes we should send it to the Social Science Chairs to respond to, give them time to make the two changes, and have them return it to ECAS in time to get it on to the Academic Senate meeting on April 12, 2024.
    - ■ Discussion around timeline for social science chairs to revise their proposal.
  - ○ *Motion to ask Social Science chairs to respond to the report and send a revised proposal back to ECAS.* (J. Fulkerson, J. Arnold second)
    - ■ Vote: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstain.
    - ■ *Motion passed.*
- ● **DISCUSSION AND VOTE:** Neuroscience Co-Major Proposal
  - ○ Discussed possibility of asking APC to review the proposal for a Neuroscience co-major.
  - ○ Given consultation has already occurred, general agreement that APC would not be required to engage in additional consultation.
  - ○ *Motion to request APC review the co-major proposal to get feedback and recommendation on how to proceed* (W. Diestelkamp, J. Dalton second)
    - ■ *Vote:* 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstain.
    - ■ *Motion passed.*
- ● **DISCUSSION AND VOTE:** Program approvals
  - ○ Motion to approve the following items all at the same time given the relatively minor changes. (W. Diestelkamp, J. Dalton second)
    - ■ BSB-MGT: Bachelor of Science in Business Administration: Management
      - ● Added 1 course to list of options
    - ■ MSEM-ENM : Master of Science in Engineering Management
      - ● Added 1 course to list of options
    - ■ MSE-EHI : Master of Science in Education, Higher Education and Student Affairs
      - ● Replacing 3 course with 3 new courses
    - ■ Cyber Security Concentration
      - ● Already on the books, just never entered into PIM
    - ■ Finance Concentration

- - - ● Already on books, just never entered into PIM
      - ■ [Marketing Concentration](#)
        - ● Already on the books, just never entered into PIM
      - ■ Vote: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstain.
      - ■ *Motion passed*
    - ○ *Motion to approve the following items all at the same time given the relatively small minor changes.* (W. Diestelkamp, A. Kinney second)
      - ■ [MSAE-AEE : Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering](#)
        - ● Added green course listings to specify options, requirement has not changed
      - ■ [MSME-MEE : Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering](#)
        - ● Added green course listings to specify options, requirement has not changed
      - ■ [MSRC-RCL : Master of Science in Renewable and Clean Energy Engineering](#)
    - ○
      - ■ Vote: 11 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstain.
      - ■ *Motion passed.*
- **DISCUSSION:** Budget Timeline and Administrative costs (Executive Vice President Andy Horner)
  - ○ Andy is returning to meet with us to present what he was going to discuss last time, but for which we ran out of time.
    - ■ Notes that some things have changed since this previous meeting.
  - ○ Main focus is on the timeline of budget creation and detailed information on non-unit costs.
    - ■ December and January are primary time for Budget Kickoff
    - ■ January and February is budget preparation by units.
    - ■ March and April is Budget Consolidation and Executive Review using submissions from budget officers. Based on submission from units and anticipated payroll needs.
    - ■ May is when the budget goes to the Board of Trustees for review and approval.
    - ■ July is when the budget is added to Banner.
    - ■ Haven't been able to follow budget timeline closely the past few years.
  - ○ For next fiscal year, several issues require delaying the budget proposal to the Board of Trustees until June 17:
    - ■ Delays in FAFSA creates more uncertainty for forecasting.
      - ● Normally in October, universities will be getting informat in March.
      - ● Most offers will go out in April this year.
      - ● Current confirmation deadline for students is May 15, but that might change.
    - ■ Voluntarily Separation Incentive Program has been announced.
      - ● Individuals will have a 45 day window starting April 1 to decide on . Will work with groups on separation dates.
    - ■ Timeline on faculty contracts are still assumed to be the same.
    - ■ Still working through many items including merit raises:
      - ● Still determining the feasibility of a pool. Possible that merit raises (if any) won't be reflected in contract because Board of Trustees won't have approved the budget when the contracts goes out and that contracts might be delayed. This is all to be determined. Approval will be later than normal.
      - ● Prioritizing raises for promotion, then equity, and then merit.
      - ● Notes that salaries are the largest expense for university.
    - ■ Q: Would it make sense with respect to contracts to note when the budget will be approved?
  - ○ Q: Where does Academic Senate fit into consultation?
    - ■ The process begins in the units, with deans and vice presidents submitted proposed budgets aligning with priorities they set.

- - - Provost Weaver: Faculty can affect priorities through unit policies and program decisions. Working to get more data to units and more conversation with units on how best to make decisions with data.
    - EVP Andy Horner: The process currently is very bottom up, but Academic Senate consultation is very top down. Perhaps faculty in the units should be involved in the unit processes. Assumption is that deans and VPs are setting their priorities.
    - Q: How much consultation occurs in the consolidation phase?
      - Primarily between the unit leader and the university leadership. Leadership assumes the unit leaders are consulting with faculty.
      - Comment: Academic Senate consultation should probably be happening with the unit leaders, too.
      - Provost Weaver: There is a role for senior leadership but it needs to happen at unit level, too.
  - Q: Do units and departments have metrics and goals?
    - Trying to move in this direction. Items like program margin and class sizes need to be understood by units.
    - Discussion of the need for knowing targets and having commonly understood goals.
    - Discussion of how faculty can have input on goals and priorities.
    - Provost Weaver: Recent messaging to deans asks for plans on how they will respond to the current financial situation.
    - Discussion of the role of senators, deans, and administration in consultation.
  - Q: Why can't we commit to merit for next fiscal year? What else are we spending money on?
    - Provost Weaver: After receiving budget proposals, projecting a deficit. Hard to commit to a merit pool in the absence of margin.
    - EVP Andy Horner: Most of the revenue is committed to recurring expenses. Most of the items don't have a lot of discretion. Understands the concerns around merit raises and really wants to provide it. But the operating cash flow is such that it is a hard decision now.
  - ECAS thanks Andy for attending our meeting.

The following items were tabled until next meeting of ECAS:
- **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE:** FAC's report, Review of the University of Dayton Faculty Workload Guidelines
- **DISCUSSION AND VOTE:** Program approvals
  - More Substantial Changes
    - DPT-DPT : Doctor, Physical Therapy
      - Email exchange with Mary Fisher
    - MINOR-BAN : Minor in Business Analytics

Motion to thank Andy Horner for attending and to adjourn (J. Fulkerson, A. Kinney second).
- Passes by unanimous consent.

Meeting adjourned at 2:21.

Respectfully submitted by Jon Fulkerson, Secretary to the Academic Senate.