

Regular Meeting of the University Senate
Manchester Center, Hazard Board Room
February 15, 2007

Attendance

Law: Lazerow, Chair; Horton; Kelly

Arts & Sciences: Jubran; Lewis; Meter; Moran; Nadkarni; Pachence; Pierson; Pope; D. Sullivan;
Tsomo; Velo

Business: Gin; Schubert; Sumner

SOLES: Hubbard; Low

Nursing: Clark

Ex-Officio: Allen; Cordeiro; Healy; J. Sullivan

Student Representative: Vincent

Guest: Dobkin; Douglas; Herrinton

Lazerow opened the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

1. Announcements

A. Adoption Expense Reimbursement Policy. The Cabinet referred the policy to Human Resources for further analysis. Lazerow will follow up to have the policy presented at the next Cabinet meeting.

B. Summary Report of Cabinet Meeting. D. Sullivan distributed a summary of the Jan. 31 Cabinet meeting, noting that one of the six policies endorsed by the Cabinet, the Policy on Fraudulent Use of University Computers, did not receive unanimous approval and warrants the Senate's close attention.

2. Approval of minutes of February 1, 2007

The minutes of Feb. 1, 2007 were approved with the removal of the name of an honorary degree nominee.

3. Honorary degree nomination. There being no objection to the honorary degree nomination, the recommendation becomes the Senate recommendation and will be forwarded to the Academic Affairs Committee.

3. Committee reports

A. Faculty Status Committee: Proposed amendments to policies on emeritus faculty and retired faculty

The following motion is on the floor:

Motion to amend by Perakis/Meter: In the fifth paragraph: Change "encourages" to "invites" in the first line, strike the second sentence, keep the third sentence, and strike the remainder of the paragraph.

Herrinton suggested that discussion focus on the key issue, which is to change emeritus status from merely an honorary title to one that carries with it expectations of continued activity at USD.

Meter withdrew the motion.

In response to Herrinton's point, Lazerow suggested that the proposed policy is not intended to require continued service from those who receive emeritus distinction; the thrust of the proposal is to give emeritus faculty the opportunity to continue to make professional contributions.

Schubert stated that the only new criterion is “indication of continued interest in research and/or teaching,” which indicates an expectation that wasn’t intended by the committee.

Motion to amend by Schubert/Clark to: STRIKE “INDICATION OF CONTINUED INTEREST IN RESEARCH AND/OR TEACHING.” FROM THE BULLETED LIST OF THE SECOND PARAGRAPH.

Low, a member of the Faculty Status Committee, explained that each listed criterion in the policy was not intended to be a required element in making emeritus decisions. Rather, the intention was to provide a more crystallized list of criteria to consider. She agreed, however, that the language about continued interest in research and/or teaching could be interpreted as an obligation.

Herrinton stated that, historically, emeritus status has been granted based on years at USD with respect to the other criteria. Whether one wants to continue teaching or conduct research does not affect the body of work that is considered in making emeritus decisions. Another way of posing the question, then, is whether emeritus status ought to be backward looking or forward looking?

Vote: 19 – Approve; 1 – Oppose; 2 – Abstain. The motion to amend passed.

Herrinton provided the following points to consider: 1) Does the second sentence of the first paragraph, “Emeritus status makes it possible for professors to continue scholarly and teaching activities ...,” state a truth? If so, would this mean that non-emeritus retired faculty are not allowed to teach and do scholarly activities? 2) The last bullet point of the proposed policy is a constitutional amendment because the Senate constitution does not state that emeritus faculty are eligible to serve as an elected senator. 3) Does the policy apply retroactively?

J. Sullivan commented that the last paragraph requires a negative action, which is an invitation for disrespect among department and unit colleagues.

Motion to amend by Pachence/Clark to: STRIKE THE LAST PARAGRAPH, INCLUDING THE TWO BULLETED POINTS.

Low said that because the current policy does not provide guidelines about emeritus faculty members’ continued service, the onus for making such decisions falls on the department faculty.

Horton suggested that eliminating the first sentence of the fifth paragraph and the last paragraph would solve the problem identified by Low.

Vote: 16 – Approve; 1 – Oppose; 4 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Motion to amend by Horton/D. Sullivan to: ELIMINATE THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE NEW LAST PARAGRAPH.

Vote: 11 – Approve; 6 – Oppose; 4 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Motion by Pachence/Kelly to: REFER THE EMERITUS STATUS POLICY BACK TO THE FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE.

The motion passed by unanimous consent.

Lazerow referred the amendment to the Retirement Plan Policy (2.2.4), proposed by the Faculty Status Committee, to the Benefits Policy Committee for consideration and recommendation. Pachence, Benefits Policy Committee chair, said that he would convene the committee soon to address this change.

B. Executive Committee: Resolution on WASC accreditation. In response to the request of the Provost’s Office and discussion at the last Senate meeting, the Executive Committee recommends

that the Senate set aside one hour at a future meeting to serve as a focus group on WASC accreditation matters.

Motion by Clark/Schubert to: USE ONE HOUR OF THE MARCH 1, 2007 SENATE MEETING AS A FOCUS GROUP ON WASC ACCREDITATION MATTERS.

Vote: 20 – Approve; 1 – Oppose; 1 – Abstain. The motion passed.

C. Executive Committee: Resolution on Sophomore Year Experience Initiative Committee

J. Sullivan reported that the sophomore year initiative is part of the integrated learning initiatives. A recommendation of the First Year Experience Committee was to continue integrated learning for the sophomore or middle-years. The Sophomore Year Experience Committee has been asked to recommend or not recommend a sophomore year residency requirement, which would be a small part of the larger academic experience. Committee co-chairs Merrick Marino and Anne Sturz welcome new committee members.

Lewis stated that the perceptions of some A&S faculty are that the sophomore year residency requirement is a foregone conclusion, that the First Year Experience initiative needs to be assessed before a sophomore year experience initiative is begun, and that the principal motivation for a sophomore residency requirement is to fill residence halls.

Lazerow asked that faculty willing to serve on the Sophomore Year Experience Committee send him an email indicating their interest.

The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Submitted by,

David Sullivan
Secretary

Peggy Agerton
Recording Secretary