

Minutes of the Faculty Senate October 30, 2012

Attendees: J. Douglas Archer, William Berry, Karen Buranskas, Xavier Creary, Antonio Delgado, John Duffy, Morten Eskildsen, Thomas Flint, John Gaski, David Gasperetti, Liangyan Ge, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Alexandra Guisinger, Michael Hemler, Danielle Joyner, David Ladouceur, Matthew Leevy, Linda Major, Paul McGinn, Connie Mick, Eric Morgan, Carolyn Nordstrom, Sylwia Ptasinska, Catherine Perry, Dianne Pinderhughes, John Polhamus, Kali Rath, Denis Robichaud, John Robinson, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Katie Rose, Kate Rueff, Joshua Shrou, John Stamper, Joe Urbany, Sophie White, Bruce Williams, Richard Williams

Excused: Gail Bederman, Martin Haenggi, Chao-Shin Liu, Paulinus Odozor, Anthony Trozzolo, Yontao Zhang

Absent: Christine Becker, Dennis Doordan, Sandra Gustafson, George Howard, Karel Matous, Patricia Maurice

1. 7:05 start of meeting. Prayer led by Douglas Archer
2. Introductions of faculty members
3. Notice of problem with the listserv. Archer will send out an email, asking individuals to respond in order to check that the listserv is now working. Please let him know if you have experienced any difficulties with the listserv or did not receive materials for tonight's meeting.

Reports of various Senate Committees

4. The Academic Affairs Committee: Two matters were discussed by the committee.
 - a. First, at the last meeting it was noticed that there were two unelected members of the PAC who had been appointed to replace elected members on leave. This is not in the spirit of an elected committee but will be kept in place for this year. The Dean has asked the Faculty Senate (Administrative Affairs) to look into this issue and come up with a solution for the future. The academic articles give the Provost the right to appoint unlimited numbers of members to PAC. There is a recommendation that elected members comprise at least half the committee but this is only a recommendation.
 - b. Second, three proposals for new graduate programs came in front of the committee. Two - a Ph.D. in religious music and a Ph.D. in anthropology – were considered as unproblematic and are proposed to the full Senate for conversation.
 - i. A question was raised about whether this would injure the excellent undergraduate program in anthropology. It was noted by a senate member from the department that the Ph.D. was actually crafted to build off and work with the undergraduate program.
 - ii. Another question was raised about whether the music program intake was too small to be competitive. The response from a Senate member

from the music department was that sacred music was so specialized that it would not be competing against larger programs. There were also questions raised about the connection of the program with the music program.

- iii. Another question was raised about how these programs were evaluated over time. It was noted that the Anthropology program has a built in evaluations process.
- iv. The proposal passed.

5. Administrative Affairs

- a. Discussion centered on the conflict of commitment policy. The committee will recommend changes to the current document but will do so at the December 4th meetings with precedes the Academic Council meeting about the document. It was noted that there was not much enthusiasm for the current proposal or a policy in general.

6. Benefits

- a. Plan to meet with Denise to gather more information and discuss the following:
 - i. What types of services does the wellness center offer (in particular, vaccinations).
 - ii. What can be done about the problem of delays in new prescriptions with Medco.
 - iii. A list of drugs with higher co-pay.
- b. An additional issue was raised by a general Senate member about the access of retirees to Medco. It was suggested that we ask retirees directly about the success of vouchers in providing healthcare to retirees. Of the 60% of those eligible who signed up, 5% saw higher costs.

7. Students Affairs

- a. Received from Graduate Student Union a proto-resolution about the University's response to the Faculty Senate Resolution concerning improvements in graduate healthcare especially for dependents. In a month, the full Senate is likely to be asked to consider a revised version of this resolution.
- b. It was noted that the university does not compete well with peer universities in terms of providing dependent support. Although the numbers can look equivalent, other universities offer additional forms of structural support. In comparison, The Wellness Center which was to help provide support for graduate medical coverage doesn't take Medicaid and thus can't serve most graduate students' children.

8. Executive Committee – President's Dinner

- a. The provost asked for guidance about the continuation of the President's Dinner. The committee plans to recommend continuation despite the significant cost.

This type of event is one of the few that brings together the different organizations of the University. There is not a good substitute. Next question then is how to contain costs and make the dinner more enjoyable. The committee will circulate a final draft of the letter when the committee approves it.

9. Motion to adjourn at 8:39.

Next Meeting 7:00pm, Tuesday, Dec 4, 2012, 140 DeBartolo

Minutes of the Faculty Senate
7:00 pm, Tuesday, Dec. 4, 2012
Room 140 DeBartolo

Attendees: J. Douglas Archer, Christine Becker, William Berry, Karen Buranskas, Antonio Delgado, Morten Eskildsen, Thomas Flint, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Alexandra Guisinger, Michael Hemler, George Howard, Danielle Joyner, David Ladouceur, Linda Major, Paul McGinn, Connie Mick, Eric Morgan, Carolyn Nordstrom, Catherine Perry, John Polhamus, Kali Rath, John Robinson, Katie Rueff, John Stamper, Joe Urbany, Sophie White, Bruce Williams, Richard Williams

Excused: Xavier Creary, David Gasperetti, Martin Haenggi, Chao-Shin Liu, Kali Rath, Salma Saddawi, Anthony Trozzolo, Sophie White, Yongtao Zhang

Absent: Gail Bederman, Denis Doordan, John Duffy, Liangyan Ge, Matthew Leevy, Karel Matous, Patricia Maurice, Paulinus Odozor, Sylwia Ptasinska, Dianne Pinderhughes, Denis Robichaud, Katie Rose,

1. 7:05 start of meeting. Prayer led by Douglas Archer
2. Introductions of faculty members
3. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Minutes of Oct. 2, 2012 still awaiting additional information
 - b. Minutes of Oct. 30, 2012
 - i. Need to change title of music PhD to Doctorate in Musical Arts
 - ii. Under item 6A, add last name to Denise (Murphy)
4. Chair's remarks
 - a. Two major items of business: the Conflict of Commitment policy and the Master of Administration proposal.
 - i. Conflict of Commitment policy has been under discussion for so long and has had so many revisions that we can expect that it is going to pass in the Academic Council. However, this doesn't mean that the faculty senate has to enthusiastically endorse the policy.
5. Breakout into Committee Meetings
6. Committee Reports
 - a. Administrative Affairs (30 minutes)
 - i. Master of Administration proposal
 1. Many thought that the proposal was poorly written. Because of this, there was a meeting with the proposal committee to clarify issues. Simultaneously a revised proposal was submitted. Changes included a change in the name of the degree to a Masters of Management.
 2. The Academic affairs committee advises the following proposal:

- a. The faculty senate recommends that the proposed Master of Management program be approved by the academic council. However, we would like to note the following four reservations:
 - i. The college of business should make sure that future proposals are more detailed regarding courses, budgets, etc and more carefully written.
 - ii. The college of business should commit itself to staffing Masters of Management courses with a ratio of T&R faculty to non-T&R faculty that is not less than the ratio in the MBA programs.
 - iii. The college of business should utilize most of the profit generated by the program for the benefit of the program itself.
 - iv. The college of business should reconsider the name of the program because as currently named it is confusing in that it suggests that it is departmentally-based when in fact it is college-wide.
3. Comments and responses from the Senate
 - a. Were changes significant enough to request a new 6 week discussion period? Committee chair thought no.
 - b. What are the differences with a regular MBA? Members pointed out that an MBA program assumes business experience. In contrast, the MofM for people with zero business experience.
 - c. A concern was raised about the intensive summer math program and whether a typical non-business undergrad would be able to handle the courses. Additionally asked why are these courses not more oriented to management? Other members pointed out that the Masters program was to be broader than just management. The original name was a Master of Science in Business.
 - d. One member asked how such a degree would be viewed by employers. The committee chair said that committee had been told that graduates of Masters would be competitive for the same jobs as undergraduate business students coming out of Mendoza.
 - e. Why aren't we asking for rigorous changes and resubmission now? The Committee chair said that it was going to be approved by Academic Council anyway, so it was not beneficial to ask for something that wouldn't happen. Instead the committee chose to register concerns to prevent future similar proposals.

- f. Why the reservations about the details for courses? The Committee Chair noted that the content of the courses was not clear nor was how they differ from both undergraduate and MBA courses. Also, while faculty names were mentioned, these names were primarily non-T&R, so there is reason to request that the ratio is similar to other programs. In regards to budget, many numbers were not backed with information.
 - g. Why not refuse to approve? Committee Chair noted that many on the committee saw role for the program, in spite of the problems with the proposal. Another issue is that if we wait another month for approval, then the program won't be up and running by the summer.
 - h. One member raised the branding problem with the label. Could we add a request to rethink the name? Since the course is not going to be management specific, why not change the name.
 - 4. The proposal was put forth.
 - 5. Comments about proposal.
 - a. Please pass along all comments made.
 - b. Why is the university providing a Masters degree that is equal to a graduating senior? A number of comments followed on the theme that this degree is allowing students to add on business courses afterwards.
 - 6. A friendly amendment was made, adding point four above.
 - 7. The proposal with friendly amendments was passed with some abstentions and some no votes.
- b. Academic Affairs
 - i. Conflict of Commitment Policy. Committee chair stated that the best hope is to make some improvements to the current proposal.
 - 1. Currently recommending no discussion about group one, two, or three.
 - 2. Instead, the committee would like to focus discussion on Group four (things outside your department or school and require involvement of the provost).
 - a. The committee agreed that working full-time outside for two employers does seem something that the provost should be involved in.
 - b. In comparison, "Consulting, holding office in a scholarly or professional organization, or editing a learned journal and any other potentially compromising activities for five or more workdays per month" does not seem something that the provost should be involved. Additionally, the committee disagrees with the wording that the default should be to limit such work to a three-year life-span.

- c. That said, the committee chair stated that it is not clear what the alternative language should be. Change 5 to 7 days? These units have no definition. How many hours do these entail?
 - d. Main problem is that it suggests that these activities are suspect.
3. Comments from Senate
- a. Need to change it away so not “compromising activities” since these activities aren’t necessarily compromising.
 - b. Why is holding an office inherently compromising. There is no difference between doing too much teaching or too much research. The Chair or Dean should just talk to me about the balance.
 - c. The Chair explained that at originally came from a different attempt to talk about this balance between service, teaching, and research. One of the difficult issues is how we define service.
 - d. Another problem noted was in the choice of the word “full-time”. Wouldn’t be acceptable if it were 95% or 80%. Where is the limit.
 - e. It was suggested that should frame limit in terms of “once you are compromising your duties to the university”. The Chair of the Committee noted that such language was problematic since there would be disagreement about whether work had been compromised.
 - f. A further question about the definition of potentially compromising activities. It was pointed out that if ice-skated 5 days a week this would constitute an activity not normally defined as a faculty member’s responsibility and thus compromising.
 - g. One member noted that the document needed greater coherence in terminology since journal work is in one place seen as service and in other areas compromising activity. The Chair responded that committee had added word “primary” to try to improve coherence.
 - h. Another question was asked about being an editor. Having read the document it would seem as if could not do this. The chair of the committee suggested that the working of the preamble makes it clear that such activity not prohibited.
4. Because of time constraints, the committee chair proposed the following vote
- a. I approve of the proposed Conflict of Commitment Policy.

- b. I disapprove of shifting from the current Outside Activities policy to the proposed Conflict of Commitment Policy.
 - c. I would approve of the shift from the current Outside Activities policy to a Conflict of Commitment policy if the criteria for including a professional activity in Group Two, Group Three, and Group Four were more demanding
 - 5. Process of voting with ballots was proposed, seconded, and voted yay by acclamation.
 - 6. Result was declared:
 - a. 13 votes disapproving
 - b. 11 votes approving if changes were made
 - c. Benefits
 - i. Benefit committee chair noted that last time there were many complaints about the Wellness Center using Quest. Since these issues were raised, HR went back to South Bend Medical Foundation to handle the lab work. Additionally, if you do the lab work at the University, you do not have pay a co-pay.
 - ii. Also noted that the Wellness Center is getting crowded, and they are looking to hire another physician.
 - d. Student Affairs
 - i. Student Affairs has made progress converting a proto resolution on student health insurance into a full resolution.
 - ii. It will make the resolution at the next meeting.
7. Motion to adjourn at 8:51.

Next Meeting, 7:00 pm, Tuesday, Feb. 5, 2013, 140 DeBartolo

Minutes of the Faculty Senate

7:00 pm, Tuesday, May 7, 2013

Room 140 DeBartolo

Attendees: William Berry, Matthew Capdevielle, Mark Caprio, Anjan, Chakravartty, Antonio Delgado, John Gaski, David Gasperetti, Liangyan Ge, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Alexandra Guisinger, Michael Hemler, Danielle Joyner, Michael Kirsch, Matthew Leevy, Paul McGinn, Eric Morgan, Carolyn Nordstrom, Sylwia Ptasinska, Catherine Perry, Kali Rath, Denis Robichaud, Jeanne Romero-Severson, Salma Saddawi, Marsha Stevenson, Richard Williams

Excused: Nancy Joyce, Walter Nigorski, Sandra Vera-Munoz

Absent: Christine Becker, Gail Bederman, Xavier Creary, Dennis Doordan, John Duffy, Thomas Flint, George Howard, Linda Major, Karel Matous, Dianne Pinderhughes, Joshua Shrout, John Stamper, Joe Urbany, Sophie White, Bruce Williams

1. 7:05 start of meeting.
2. Elections of new officers happened, all were approved. Chair-Paul McGinn, Vice-Chair-Antonio Delgado, Co-Secretaries- Danielle Joyner and Denis Robichaud, Treasurer- Jeanne Romero-Serverson
3. Chair, Paul McGinn, introduces himself.
4. Introductions of faculty members
5. No Approval of Minutes
6. Break out to committees.
7. Committee Reports
 - Academic Affairs
 - Bruce Williams, (Mathematics) new committee chair – was absent
 - Potential issues to consider:
 - Tenure and Promotion & Salaries, criteria esp. for women
 - Consider electronic learning issues/e-consortium
 - New School of International Studies
 - Faculty Club
 - Administrative Affairs
 - Postpone election of new chair until September meeting, issues decided next fall
 - Solicit Representatives for :
 - ECDC: Alexandra Guisinger (Poly Sci)
 - Campus Life Council: two senators will rotate: Rich Williams and maybe Carolyn Nordstrom

- Traffic Committee: will be voted on in the fall-in the mean time we will investigate who is in charge to obtain a more complete description of the commitment

- Benefits

- Nasir Ghiaseddin will remain committee chair

- Potential issues:

- Meet with HR over the summer to discuss next year's potential Health Care Benefits impending changes, i.e. certification for procedures, plan to change HMO to make it more similar to PPO.
- Possibly consider how domestic partners could obtain benefits.
- Learn more about benefits in general in AAU Universities-comparison.
- Contraception issues

- Student Affairs

- John Gaski (Marketing) will remain chair of the committee

- Potential issues:

- Gradeflation

8. Treasurer's Report is submitted and will be posted

The panel discussion on Academic Freedom drew funds out of the account, \$1,746.13. Remaining balance is \$218.41. More details about the account were discussed.

Likely to continue to meet in DeBartolo next year.

9. 8:06p.m. Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully submitted,

Danielle Joyner