

9-14-2007

2007-09-14 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, "2007-09-14 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2007). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 1.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/1

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.

[Approved October 26, 2007]

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
DAYTON, OHIO
MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
September 14, 2007
KU West Ballroom, 3:00 P. M.

Senators Present: P. Benson, D. Biers (presiding), A. Brian, L. Cook, D. Darrow, G. DeMarco, W. Diestelkamp, G. Doyle, C. Duncan, T. Eggemeier, A. Fist, R. Frasca, E. Gustafson, A. Jipson, P. Johnson, R. Kearns, R. Larson, T. Lasley, L. Laubach, C. Letevac, R. Marak, J. O'Gorman, M. Patterson, R. Penno, F. Pestello, D. Poe, Y. Raffoul, J. Saliba, A. Seielstad, L. Snyder, T. Stevens, R. Wells

Senators Excused: C. Bowman, R. Crum, J. King, L. Kloppenberg, D. Sink

Guests: J. Untener, J. Whitaker, P. Powers, E. Hicks, K. Webb, K. Cross, F. Peñas-Bermejo, R. Perales, T. Rizvi, P. Meyers, T. Wilbers, M. Daniels, D. Klco, D. Courte, J. Farrelly, V. Keen, B. Johnston, J. Morris, J. Massucci, M. Donahue, A. Koziol, S. Wilkinson.

1. Opening Prayer: Senator DeMarco opened the meeting with prayer.

2. Roll Call: Thirty-two of thirty-seven Senators were present. Two student Senators will be elected by the end of the day today.

3. Minutes: April 20, 2007: Moved and seconded, minutes were approved with minor corrections.

4. Open discussion of Doc-06-10 University Promotion and Tenure Policy:

D. Biers introduced the document and opened the floor for discussion. For the document to be approved, 50% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty must vote and 50% of those voting must approve the document. The following points were discussed and comments made:

- It was noted that there is a typo in section II. D. 3. It was agreed that typos can be corrected in the posted document.
- A question was raised about the timetable for submission of materials. It was suggested that allowing materials to be submitted after a fixed cut-off date might allow individuals to “play the system.” In addition this might also serve to diminish the work of the initial committee. It appears that deadlines for the institution are final whereas they are not for the individual candidates. D. Biers suggested one reason for allowing for addition to materials was related to differing policies in departments as to whether forthcoming work is considered.
- The role of administrative authority for the President was queried. It was noted that this is language that reflects the desire of the Board of Trustees to change its role in relationship to tenure and promotion.

- It was noted that the document does not contain anything about substantive criteria. It was suggested that a preamble with aspirational goals would encourage quality.
- It was suggested that including service to the community could be problematic if individuals listed items not clearly related to their professional work.
- It was asked what would happen if the dates were not met by the administration. Would tenure be automatic? J. Untener responded that there would not be tenure by default and accommodations would be made.
- It was asked if the policy would be reviewed on some regular basis if approved. It was noted that the proposed committee is charged with reviewing issues related to unit policies and bringing issues forward to the Academic Senate. It was also noted that the Senate can review a policy at any point.
- It was asked if the document contained provision for stopping the tenure clock for maternity purposes. It does.
- It was noted the unit P&T documents will have to establish procedures for approving such documents. It was suggested that the underlying assumption was that units would vote. Others suggested that was not clear.

D. Biers concluded the discussion encouraging members to vote.

5. Higher Learning Commission:

J. Untener reported that a team of twelve will arrive on Sunday, September 16 and will leave on the following Wednesday. Their purpose is to confirm the self-study. There are planned meetings scheduled, including open forums. The team will also spend some informal time where spontaneous questions may emerge. There will be an observer from the US Department of Education with the team. The faculty lounge in Keller Hall will be used as a team room. Members of the Academic Senate were invited to visit the room following today's meeting.

6. Campus Master Plan Update:

R. Perales gave the Academic Senate a presentation on the Campus Master Plan. F. Pestello introduced the presentation with remarks about the process, some of its frustrating moments, and the current situation. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees will review the plan next week. It will be presented to the ELC on September 25. Information will be distributed to the community. There will be forums for faculty and staff in early October. The board will vote on the plan at its October meeting. Details of a long-term (20-30 years) plan and a short term (5-7 years) were presented. After the presentation the following questions and issues were raised:

- When will proposed demolitions begin and will consideration of the historical importance of certain building, such as Rike which was an early theater and then the women's gym, be taken into consideration?
- Where will parking go?
- Will the University consider using eminent domain in the neighborhoods?
- When will the PowerPoint of the presentation be released? (After September 25)
- Why is phase three of the Science Center not in the short term plan? It was noted that this depends on generating research money and donations.

- What is the size of the space dedicated to the University Center for the Arts? It was noted that P. Benson is leading efforts on this project.
- The green facility is clearly a concern raised by students. Why just one facility? Why not make this part of all future building?
- Has there been any consideration of a faculty club? It was noted that this might be considered with any proposed Alumni House. It was also noted that the University is trying to get an “up-scale” restaurant in the Brown Street development.
- Is a four-year residency requirement an attempt to “assault” landlords? It was suggested that this is motivated by needs for safety and quality of accommodations. It was noted that the requirement would be for University owned or approved housing. It was also noted that the radius for this requirement would need to be determined. Students prefer low density housing.
- Should UDRI have a separate facility? It is not on the plan. It was suggested that the current situation promotes better communication and collaboration between UDRI employees and faculty.
- The new entrance to C lot should be a priority.
- What about providing space for the Academic Senate and its activities?
- How will the Marianist charism and sense of community be maintained in the face of expansion? Are we giving due consideration to the place that we are and what needs to be preserved in any process of development?
- Has a monorail to the arena been considered?
- What will happen to the College offices when O’Reilly is demolished?
- Traffic to KU still seems to be an issue on the plan. Have we given up the desire to move to a more pedestrian and bike-friendly environment? It was suggested that the move of the student union to C-lot could help address this.
- R. Perales is open to receiving suggestions and questions. His e-mail is: Richard.Perales@notes.udayton.edu

7. Committee Reports:

Faculty Affairs Committee: G. Doyle reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee has held two open sessions on the Promotion and Tenure Policy that will be voted on next week. They are now beginning work on the Post-tenure Review issue. They hope to have a preliminary document by the end of the term. It will be developmental in emphasis. It has been suggested that this be a post-tenure peer consultation process that is forward looking.

Academic Policies Committee: D. Darrow reported for the Academic Policies Committee. They have reviewed the proposal related to the recommendation of the *Habits of Reflection* document. In April they reported to the Academic Senate about a set of working groups that had been established to conduct this work. Because of what is judged to be the limited success of this approach, they are now moving to a single committee of eight members which will be a sub-committee of APC and which will be representative of the University. He reviewed the areas to be represented and the general charge and time-line for

reporting for that committee. It is assumed that this will be a two to four-year process. Work will begin in October with progress reports in December and April. A final draft report will be due August 15, 2008. He also outlined a process for selection of members of the committee which involves selection of the chairperson by APC and recommendations to be received from the deans for the additional members, to then be appointed by the decision of APC. This is intended to be a widely consultative process. This report elicited discussion and questions:

- It was suggested that the working groups had not been given sufficient opportunity to work. They were not established until Spring 2007 and then asked to hold back on the work assuming that it would be carried out in 2007-2008. The initial philosophy for these groups was to use expertise of members of the UD community and to research best practices. This direction was thoughtful and community oriented. The new process may well compromise this intention.
- It was suggested that the process for nomination of members to the committee should be opened widely so that faculty not always in the “loop” will know the committee and could offer to serve. It was suggested that the deans would distribute this information. It was also suggested that APC should put out a call for nominations. It was noted that APC plans to invite all faculty who had agreed to serve on the working groups to a meeting to provide input.
- It was noted that the library faculty are not represented on the proposed committee. Since they are the most neutral in terms of academic turf and since they support the curriculum, it would seem that this is an offensive oversight. It was suggested that APC should reconsider the constitution of the committee and add a representative from the library faculty. They are different from other constituencies that might want to be represented because they, like all the other areas proposed for representation, are academic.
- It was asked why a course reduction and compensation is appropriate for this group when many others contribute considerable time for important work. It was suggested that this would encourage the group to meet the timeline and to be a dedicated group of revolutionaries.
- It was noted that the work of this committee would be but the first step in a long process of vetting proposals.

Student Academic Policies Committee: A. Fist reported that the members of the Student Academic Policies Committee were working on establishing a meeting time. They will address the change of ‘P’ to ‘IP.’ They will continue work on the Honor Code and hope to complete that this year. They will also be looking at the instrument used for the evaluation of faculty by students.

8. Adjournment: Moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 5:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Johnson