

Regular Meeting of the University Senate
Manchester Center, Hazard Board Room
May 4, 2006

Attendance

Law: Lazerow, Chair; Kelly

Arts & Sciences: Guerrieri; Jubran; Moran; Nadkarni; Nelson; Otto; Pachence;
D. Sullivan; Tsomo; Velo; Walsh

Business: Gin; Schubert

Education: Low

Nursing: Clark

Ex-Officio: Anvari; Cole; Drinan; Lyons; J. Sullivan

Student Representative: Melissa Miranda

Guests: Dobkin; Douglas; Herrinton; Payton; Wessells

Lazerow called the meeting to order at 12:17 p.m.

1. Announcements

A. Funding a USD student computing system from efficiency savings

President Lyons provided background information about the cost efficiency study, now in its third year. Finance & Administration, Student Affairs, and University Relations have completed the cost-efficiency process. Academic Affairs deferred the process until J. Sullivan arrived. The process netted nearly \$1.9 million in sustainable savings in Student Affairs and Finance & Administration combined. Lyons had told the Senate that the money wouldn't be spent until a project was found that would serve the entire campus and support one of the strategic directions. The Executive Council and Deans' Council have decided to allocate the savings toward technology.

Wessells summarized USD's problems in implementing the Oracle student system. He had surveyed the nation's 25 most-connected institutions and found that PeopleSoft and SunGard SCT Banner were the favored systems. The survey showed that SunGard SCT is a good fit for USD, both in terms of costs and system features. Two critical products are bundled with the student system: Luminous, a portal product, and xTender, an imaging product. The student system can be completed in 24 months and the basic portal may be up in November 2006. The project cost is \$5.7 million.

In response to an inquiry from D. Sullivan, Wessells provided costs for other IT projects, including network replacement at \$1.2 million, hiring a network engineer and replacing core routers at about \$300,000, and developing a new mail system at a cost of between \$300,000 and \$350,000. New personnel would be permanent budget line items.

Resolution from Kelly, seconded by Clark: BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNIVERSITY SENATE SUPPORTS MARY LYONS' DECISION TO DEVOTE THE EFFICIENCY SAVINGS TO THE TECHNOLOGY SECTOR, AND SPECIFICALLY TO STUDENT SYSTEMS.

Vote: 18 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain. The resolution passed.

B. Other

1) Board of Trustees Committee meetings. The Committees of the Board will meet and Senate representatives will submit committee reports. The Mission and Vision Committee and University Relations Committee meetings were cancelled.

Gin reported financial data highlights submitted prior to the Finance Committee meeting. The University's net assets at the end of March 2006, compared to a year ago, are up over \$53 million, a gain of more than 10%. Through nine months of the current fiscal year, revenues lead expenditures \$21.3 to \$15.7 million, a surplus of \$5.6 million. Of the \$12 million operating surplus projected for the end of the year (June 30), \$4 million will be designated for minor capital projects and \$8 million will go into the plant reserve fund.

2) University Senate meeting schedule 2006-2007. The proposed schedule meetings are: September 14, September 28, October 12, October 26, November 8, November 30, December 14, February 1, 2007, February 15, March 1, March 15, March 29, April 19, and May 3.

2. Committee reports

A. Executive Committee & Faculty Status Committee: Policy Prohibiting Illegal, Dishonest or Fraudulent Conduct

Lazerow provided background information on the development of the policy. He noted that for discharge of faculty, including non-tenured faculty, as a result of a policy violation, the proceedings would revert to the discharge for good cause section of the ARRT policy. He also noted, with senators concurring, that the Senate should review the policy in a year or two to assess how it has been applied.

University Counsel made two commitments to the Senate: 1) In any proceeding involving non-financial dealings related to the faculty member that the investigation of that matter would be transferred from the auditor to the appropriate dean, and 2) the University Counsel would make a report after one year of experience with the policy on how it would work with as much detail as she could supply without violating the confidence, so no one involved could be identified specifically.

Vote: 16 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 1 – Abstain. The motion passed.

B. Executive Committee

1) Confirmation of Adam Kolber (Law) as the Senate representative to the Information Resources Council, and Ani Velo (A&S) as the alternate representative.

Motion to amend by Pachence, seconded by Clark, that: ANI VELO WILL BE THE SENATE REPRESENTATIVE AND ADAM KOLBER THE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE.

Vote: 13 – Approve; 1 – Oppose; 2 – Abstain. The amendment passed.

Vote on motion as amended: 15 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain.

2) Tobacco Policy.

Senators discussed the benefits and the shortcomings of the policy.

Vote: 13 – Approve; 3 – Oppose; 1 – Abstain. The motion passed.

3) Immunization Policy.

Lazerow explained that the Immunization Policy previously approved lacks an implementation process that would apply to incoming students and resident students. A registration block would be posted on the student's account until the Student Health Center clears the student.

Vote: 17 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 1 – Abstain. The motion passed.

4) Proposed academic program review.

Sullivan stated that she believes a systematic academic program review process will aid efforts for continuous improvement and provide an important foundation for an academic plan. She

doesn't know how best to design the process. The draft Academic Program Review has been revised in consultation with various academic groups, most notably the Academic Assembly.

Clark asked for clarification about the underlying purpose for having both internal and external processes. Sullivan said that an external component is needed to assess the allocation of resources to a given program and to assure quality control. The hope is that foremost it will be a valuable tool for continuous improvement and will be refreshed and aided by external people.

Drinan said that the College's Academic Affairs and Planning Committee suggested changes to the draft plan that are consistent with the spirit of academic program review, and the majority of the Academic Assembly supported the AAPC report, which balances a desire to maintain the autonomy of the academic units while providing a means to assure academic quality across the University. The College's version of the plan would focus attention on making qualitative improvements, start from a lower base of expectations about what the provost-level committee would be doing, and strive to develop program review experience over a period of years. The College differs from the professional schools in terms of external accreditation processes, and the faculty are sensitive to that fact.

Pachence said that the Schools undergo rigorous external review. Dobkin said that for the purposes of institutional accreditation all units would need to participate in an equal, systematic process of program review. The review process will incorporate professional accreditations and will probe items that professional accreditations don't always assess.

Motion by Kelly, seconded by Clark, to: EXTEND THE MEETING BY 10 MINUTES.

Vote: Passed by voice vote.

Clark supports the idea of creating an academic review committee, but she noted that serving on this committee would be labor intensive; faculty will need to be compensated.

Herrinton said academic quality at USD has not been defined; it would be an important outcome of the process. What is the balance between teaching and scholarly productivity in each of the units and among units? The professional accreditation process isn't adequate because it doesn't address the qualities that define USD and it doesn't identify what the five units have in common.

Dobkin said an issue in the two drafts is the role of the Academic Review Committee. The College has proposed that the ARC play a supporting role. The Provost envisioned the ARC to be a faculty body that would make recommendations.

Herrinton said that he favors faculty-centered processes and focus. The Provost's draft puts more responsibility on the ARC and less on the dean. The College's draft would reverse that relationship: The dean would consult with the ARC, and then the dean would inform the Provost.

Clark said the standards by which the units are evaluated should be specified before the process is developed to assess whether the standards are met.

Lazerow said the Executive Committee commented that both drafts are vague as to how the ARC is composed. The Executive Committee recommends that faculty should be elected by their peers.

2. Approval of Minutes of April 20, 2006

Motion by Clark, seconded by Drinan, to: APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 20, 2006 WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGE: p. 4, 4.A.1), line 7, change "either" to "neither."

Vote: Passed by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

Submitted by,

David Sullivan
Secretary

Peggy Agerton
Recording Secretary