University Senate Minutes for January 13, 2011
Names in italic represent senators who were present:

**Biological Science**
*E. L. Beard*

**Business (College of)**
Wing Fok
Pat Lynch
Karen Arnold
Jerry Goolsby

**Chemistry**
Joelle Underwood

**Classical and Modern Languages and Cultures**
Blanca Anderson
Bob Dewell
Nathan Henne

**Criminal Justice**
*Dee Harper*

**English**
*Robert Bell*
*Barbara Ewell*
*Mark Yakich*
*Janelle Schwartz*

**History**
Robert Gerlich, S. J.
*Maurice Brungardt*

**Law (College of)**
*Lawrence Moore, S. J.*
*Markus Puder - proxy*
*Andrea Armstrong*
*Johanna Kalb*
Luz Molina
*Steve Singer - proxy*
Karen Sokol
*Irme Szalai*
Steve Higgenson (Etheldra Scoggin proxy)

**Law Library**
*Etheldra Scoggin - proxy*

**Mass Communication (School of)**
*David Zemmels*
*Larry Lorenz*

**Monroe Library**
*Teri Gallaway*
*Ria Newhouse*

**Mathematical Sciences**
Ralph Tucci

**Ministry (Institute for)**
Kathleen O’Gorman

**Music**
Alice Clark
Meg Frazier
*James MacKay*
*John Murphy*
Janna Saslaw
John Snyder (sub for Alice Clark)

**Nursing (School of)**
*Kim Brannagan*
Lisa Linville
*Mary Oriol*

**Philosophy**
*Joe Berendzen*
*Jon Altschul*

**Physics**
Patrick Garrity

**Political Science**
*Conrad Raabe*

**Psychology**
*Evan Zucker*
*Erin Dupuis*
Religious Studies
Sr. Terri Bednarz
Boyd Blundell

Sociology
Marcus Kondkar

Theater Arts and Dance
Geoffrey Hall

Visual Arts
Nancy Bernardo
Bill Kitchens

Guests:
Ed Kvet, Provost
Elizabeth Kordahl, Exec Asst to Provost
Isabel Medina, Law School
Jim Klebbar, Law School
CALL TO ORDER: 3: 30pm

INVOCATION: Father Moore

December 2010 minutes approved

REMARKS FROM CHAIR: No remarks reported.

REPORTS:

Senate Awards – Joe Berendzen

Dr. Berendzen re-emphasized the need for volunteers due to the high number of nominations for senate awards. Dr. Berendzen is requesting volunteers to assist the committee. The committee received over 100 emails with nominations and all of the materials are in. There are approximately two dozen nominees for each award. The awards will be presented at the January 21, 2011 Convocation. A meeting will be held Tuesday or Wednesday of next week to finalize awards. Please contact Dr. Berendzen if you can assist in reviewing the materials and making decisions on awards. Dr. Berendzen stated that he would make electronic copies to assist committee members in reviewing materials.

Senate Executive Committee Report – Barbara Ewell

Dr. Raabe stated that we received a letter from the AAUP requesting the Senate Executive Committee to respond to questions regarding ascension. Dr. Raabe suggested that the SEC read over this document carefully and come up with a draft of our estimation of fulfillment by the February meeting. Dr. Kvet concurred and February’s meeting will complete response.

Dr. Ewell stated that the SCAP Joint Committee is currently discussing Pathways. Note: Laurie Phillips is taking the place of Tom Spence who had to resign. We are working on getting a resolution by the end of the semester. Proliferating committees – 1) discussion took place regarding the senate taking a lot of time approving committees and protocols before they go to the FHC and this process is very inefficient 2) the senate is necessary for approving critical committees, but proposals for new committees should go directly to the FHC before coming before the senate. We suggest we go back to the original protocol that all new committees, including the committees on the agenda today, go through the FHC first.
Faculty Handbook Revision Committee progress report – Dee Harper

Dr. Harper stated that the last two meetings of the FHC were consumed with Chapter 1 dealing with sexual harassment.

Dr. Ewell questioned proper protocols on senate reviews of proposals and committees prior to FHC reviewing them. Dr. Harper concurred that the FHC should review all proposals prior to senate review.

Dr. Raabe requested the consent of the senate for some items to move straight to the FHC prior to senate review. Senate unanimously agreed that the original procedure be put back in place.

Provost’s Report – Ed Kvet

Dr. Kvet reported as follows:

- SCAP approved the common curriculum. Expected implementation Fall, 2012.
- AAUP letter – will be meeting Jan. 26th.
- Facilities Update – concluded 1st phase for Monroe – cost estimates are in process and we are looking at three or four different options. Recommendations will be going to the President in the next couple of weeks and a decision should be made in February. Architects will be working room-by-room soon after.
- Faculty searches underway - Law School Dean, Library Dean, Honors Director, Grants Director.
- Sustainability recycling – will be making recommendation to Provost and President.
- Priorities of the provost office:
  - Five year SAX review coming up – please work diligently through this
  - Initiatives – role of retention and graduation, role of advising
  - Undergraduate research
  - FHC – harassment and discrimination policy will be concluding
  - We will be working on disability policy in the near future
  - Online education
  - External evaluation in the honors program
  - Budget update – the budget committee will be looking at 2013
  - New Faculty hiring has been a huge part of the budget recently
  - We are very proud of our student demographics and 68% receive aid.
OLD BUSINESS

Programs Review Criteria – Marcus Kondkar

The program review criteria will be discussed at the next meeting.

Grants, Sabbaticals and Leaves motions – Isabel Medina, George Capowich

Dr. Capawich stated the following process.

Last year the Senate approved a one-year change to shift the responsibility for review and recommendations for approval of sabbatical applications away from the University Committee on Grants and Leaves to the respective College Deans with the understanding that the issue would be revisited this year in order to discuss whether the change should become permanent. The following outline is presented as a means for initiating this discussion.

Applications since Fall 2008 (Year indicates the year in which the sabbatical taken):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Applications</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Declined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2008-09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2009-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2010-11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2011-12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Procedure:
1. Applications reviewed by applicants’ chairs and deans.
2. Recommended applications forwarded to Committee on Grants and Leaves.
3. Committee reviews and makes recommendations to Provost.
4. Provost notifies applicants of decisions.

Proposed Procedure:
1. Applications reviewed by applicants’ department chairs.
2. Department chairs forward recommended applications to their college deans.
3. Deans review and make recommendations to Provost.
4. Provost notifies applicants.

Rationale for Proposed Change:
1. Request originated with the Provost and FHRC and sent to the G&L Committee.
2. Deans agree with proposed change as expressed in Provost Council.
3. Difficult for Committee to assess reasonableness of proposal and effect on Depts.
4. Deans better informed about department and college needs.
5. In the overwhelming number of cases, the Committee follows deans’ recommendations. Between 2008 and 2010, the Committee recommended approval of 42 applications out of 43 submissions. The Provost concurred with all of these recommendations.

Question was raised regarding sabbaticals having appeal process when they are not approved. This will need to be discussed in further detail at a later date.
Dr. Medina handed out alternative motions to the current procedure. Dr. Medina stated that it is a serious concern when we are not acting consistent with the Faculty Handbook. She stated that we should amend the handbook prior to changing systems. Also, Dr. Medina was concerned that taking away the sabbatical review from the grants and leaves committee takes away faculty input in the process. This is a layer of faculty and scholarship involvement that is crucial. This is a way for the provost to get faculty input as well. Dr. Medina states that we gain as scholars as we review each other and it also provides an opportunity for faculty to get a sense of other disciplines.

Dr. Medina stated that it is important for the institution to provide pre-tenure sabbatical for academic leaves and she urged the senate to consider this. Dr. Medina stated that scholarship is the driving force for tenure.

Dr. Medina made the following motion.

- Motion: Recommend that the university adopt pre-tenure leaves with full pay for one semester.
- Motion seconded
- Open for discussion
- It does have budget implications we have to consider priorities
- Call to question
- Second to question
- Seconded motion: Recommend the university adopt pre-tenure leaves with full pay
  - In favor 17
  - Opposed 12
  - Abstention 5
  - Motion passes

New recommendation will be forwarded to the Faculty Handbook Committee.

Proposal for Internationalization Review and Advisory Committee – Dee Harper

Dr. Harper stated that this is the second reading for this proposal and the senate should vote on this proposal at this meeting.

Jim Klebbar, from the Law School, stated that faculty at the Law School have serious reservations regarding this proposal interfering with current protocols in foreign programs. Currently the Law School has extensive foreign program reviews and standards, most of which are set through the American Bar Association. Therefore, the Law School should be exempt from this advisory committee.
Dr. Raabe requested senators vote on the exception to the Law School regarding foreign programs as an editing change.

- Open to all faculty for discussion
- Proposal to re-commit
- All voted
- All approved
- None opposed
- No abstentions

There will be an exception to the Law School regarding foreign programs as an editing change.

Protocol for the Affirmative Action and Diversity Committee – Dee Harper

In regards to Dr. Medina’s former questions regarding the Affirmative Action and Diversity Committees role and clarifications, Dr. Harper stated that he brought the concerns to Dr. Dequir and Dr. Dequir will take concerns back to the committee for further discussion.

NEW BUSINESS - None

ADJOURNMENT: 5:15pm