

Regular Meeting of the University Senate

Hahn Pavilion, Room 110

March 4, 2004

Attendance

Arts & Sciences: Dobkin, Chair; Branch; Herrinton; Lewis; Liao; Loer; Otto; Pachence; Payne; Sullivan; Walsh

Business: Ayers; Schubert; Smith

Education: None

Law: Horton; Kelly

Nursing: Orsi

Ex-Officio: Drinan

Student Representative: Castanos; Gallant; Niederkorn

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

1. Announcements

a) President approvals. Dr. Mary Lyons has approved Senate motions concerning Senate oversight of policies and the foreword to the *Policy and Procedures Manual*. She has also approved Senate representation on the Academic Calendar Committee, for which an appointment is needed.

b) Presidential updates to the Senate. Dr. Lyons will be present at the March 25, 2004 meeting to discuss the results of a recent financial analysis of University revenues and expenditures.

c) Update on honorary degree nominations. The Law School's honorary degree nomination was approved by the Academic Affairs Committee and by the Board of Trustees. Board discussion of an additional nomination was postponed until the Board's April meeting. Payne recommended that the Honorary Degrees Form be reformatted to provide a larger space for the nomination rationale, a part of the form which nominators tend to overlook. Dobkin said another candidate, at the request of the President and Provost, will be reviewed by the Honorary Degrees Committee.

d) Institutional Review Board review. IRB Chair Annette Taylor has reviewed the latest revised Human Subjects policy and is looking for those who might help her make revisions to the policy. Those interested should contact Dobkin.

e) Senate retreat and Summer meetings. Dobkin suggested Wednesday, May 26 for a Senate retreat; incoming and outgoing Senators will be invited. The Senate will need a mechanism during the summer to review policies. The second Thursday of each month was suggested for Summer Senate dates. The Executive Committee will discuss these matters further.

2. Approval of the Feb. 19, 2004 minutes

Motion by Payne, seconded by Kelly, to: APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 19, 2004.

Vote: Passed by voice vote.

3. Old business/Action items

a) Reconsideration of Senate resolution regarding the Academic Calendar Committee. The Senate has moved to reconsider the following motion: *The Senate requests that the membership of the Academic Calendar Committee be changed to include at least one representative of the Senate.*

Vote to reconsider the previous motion on the Academic Calendar Committee: 17 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Motion to amend by Herrinton, seconded by Payne, to: ADD TO THE PREVIOUS MOTION THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE: THE SENATE AUTHORIZES THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO APPOINT AN AD HOC COMMITTEE WITH THE CHARGE OF EXAMINING THE “GUIDELINES FOR THE CREATION OF ACADEMIC CALENDARS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO” AND REPORTING BACK TO THE SENATE WITH ITS FINDINGS.

The amendment rationale, which was included with the meeting agenda, states that the Academic Calendar used by the academic units, excluding Law, clearly affects the general quality of studies in those units. The number of teaching days in a semester, the length of a class period, and the continued existence of Intersession are all examples of issues that involve the Academic Calendar and also affect the general quality of studies. In order to ensure adequate faculty input and oversight of the Academic Calendar, the Guidelines for the Creation of Academic Calendars at the University of San Diego need to be considered and approved by a faculty body. Since these guidelines affect two or more schools, the appropriate body can only be the Senate. In the interest of efficiently using its time, however, the Senate should have a committee look at the Guidelines and the issues surrounding them before it takes them up.

Vote: 17 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Vote on amended motion: 17 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain. The amended motion passed.

The amended motion now reads: The Senate requests that the membership of the Academic Calendar Committee be changed to include at least one representative of the Senate. The Senate authorizes the Executive Committee to appoint an ad hoc committee with the charge of examining the “Guidelines for the Creation of Academic Calendars at the University of San Diego” and reporting back to the Senate with its findings.

b) Academic Assembly motion to create a Faculty Committee on Financial Aid Policy.

Dobkin stated that President Lyons hired a financial aid consultant at the beginning of the year to revise the matrix by which USD determines admissions. Dobkin contacted Bissonnette, who said that the Financial Aid Advisory group of deans and vice presidents is an appropriate place for faculty involvement in the process. He said the matrix was redone with different weightings applied to admissions criteria, and he said that the new model is complex and difficult to explain. The yield from the matrix will be known in the fall.

Branch, expressing concerns raised by the Assembly’s Academic Affairs and Planning Committee, stated that the Scholarship Committee of *ex-officio* members has little faculty representation. It meets once a year after policies have been decided, and there is no mechanism to provide criticism or revisions. Because financial aid concerns more than one school it is now before the Senate.

Herrinton said financial aid falls within Senate jurisdiction because it affects the general quality of studies. Students’ performance in the classroom is affected by the possible loss of scholarships. The same argument can be made about the Admissions policy. Lewis said this is an opportunity to expand the Senate’s presence in the existing committee structure and to become a more viable participant in decision-making.

Motion to amend by Payne, seconded by Sullivan, to: ADD “ADMISSIONS AND” TO SECOND LINE, AFTER “ON,” AND TO ADD “AND ADMISSIONS” AT THE END TO READ: The faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences requests that the University Senate act to

establish a Faculty Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid Policy. This Committee, with a composition proportionate to the size of the full-time faculty in each of the affected academic units, would be responsible for representing faculty views in the examination, review, and development of University guidelines and policies governing financial aid and admissions.

Vote: 17 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Motion to amend by Horton, seconded by Payne, to: REPLACE “THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES REQUESTS THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ACT TO ESTABLISH A” WITH “THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ESTABLISHES AN AD HOC” FACULTY COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID POLICY.

Horton said that starting with an ad hoc committee is preferable to creating a standing committee, which would require an amendment to the By-Laws and an absolute vote by the Senate and faculty in favor of the amendment. The ad hoc committee could, as part of its charge, assess the utility of creating a standing committee.

Vote: 17 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Motion by Pachence, seconded by Kelly, to: REMOVE THE CLAUSE “, WITH A COMPOSITION PROPORTIONATE TO THE SIZE OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY IN EACH OF THE AFFECTED ACADEMIC UNITS,” TO READ: The University Senate establishes an ad hoc Faculty Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid Policy. This Committee would be responsible for representing faculty views in the examination, review, and development of University guidelines and policies governing financial aid and admissions.

Lewis stated that the proposal came from Arts & Sciences, which has the most students and faculty involved; it would be appropriate for the committee composition to be weighted accordingly. Also, the language coming from A&S wasn’t meant to exclude the Law School from the committee. Kelly said that would be taken into consideration and it will be best to leave the appointment to the usual process: the chair appoints, and the Senate confirms.

Vote: 15 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 2 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Drinan recommended that the Executive Committee ask the ad hoc committee, once appointed and confirmed, to invite the Provost to its first meeting.

Vote on motion as amended: 17 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain. The amended motion passed.

The amended motion now reads: The University Senate establishes an ad hoc Faculty Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid Policy. This Committee would be responsible for representing faculty views in the examination, review, and development of University guidelines and policies governing financial aid and admissions.

c) Amended policy on tuition remission.

The following motion to amend the substitute motion (removal of Limitations, paragraph “a,” and replace with the following Condition 5) to include “completing their first University degree or certificate program,” is on the floor:

Each employee, spouse of an employee, and dependent child of employee is eligible for the tuition remission benefit for purposes of obtaining a University of San Diego degree or certificate. The benefit must be used in a University degree-conferring or certificate-conferring program. In the event that more eligible persons apply for the tuition remission than can be accommodated within the University’s operating budget, then priority will be

given to employees, their spouses and dependent children who are in the process of completing *their first University* degree or certificate program.

Senators discussed 1) whether tuition exchange and tuition remission should be considered separate programs or considered together, 2) problems associated with a partial priority list, and 3) different priorities to consider.

Drinan said that the closer USD gets to its total enrollment cap, the more the cap becomes an issue in the tuition remission benefit. USD will either be serious about not exceeding the cap, or it will start loosening the cap. It isn't in interest of faculty to contribute to the upward slide in enrollment because of the budget consequences involved. Herrinton said the data from the Committee on Benefits Policy show that USD is at or slightly over the 1-percent-of-budget limit used to fund tuition remission. Given a liberalization of the benefit, USD will far exceed the 1% limitation. The problem is coming, and if the Senate doesn't recommend priorities, these decisions will be made by others. The issue needs to be looked at in detail and he recommends sending it back to committee to develop a prioritization of tuition remission eligibility.

Motion by Herrinton, seconded by Lewis, to: SEND THE AMENDMENT AND THE MOTION IT IS AMENDING TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Vote: 15 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 2 – Abstain. The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Submitted by,

David Sullivan
Secretary

Peggy Agerton
Recording Secretary