

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Meeting of September 30, 2011
Mendoza Business School, Room 161
3:30p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Members present: M. Brian Blake, Thomas Burish, Laura Carlson, Rev. John Coughlin, O.F.M., Greg Crawford, Margaret Doody, Mary Frandsen, John Gaski, Nasir Ghiaseddin, Tim Hunt for Laura Ritter, Rev. John Jenkins, C.S.C., Jeffrey Kantor, Peter Kilpatrick, A. Graham Lappin, John LoSecco, Jason Lovell, Christine Maziar, Dan Myers, Nell Newton, William Nichols, Hugh Page, Cathy Pieronek, Donald Pope-Davis, Ramachandran Ramanan, Neal Ravindra, J. Keith Rigby, John Robinson, Jeffrey Schorey, Jon Schwarz, Cheri Smith, Greg Sterling, Ann Tenbrunsel, Julianne Turner, Diane Parr Walker, Carolyn Woo

Members and Observers excused: John Affleck-Graves, Panos Antsaklis, Robert Bernhard, Don Bishop, Darren Davis, Michael Desch, Rev. Tom Doyle, C.S.C., William Evans, Judy Fox, John McGreevy

Members and Observers absent: Dennis Doordan, Nick Entrikin, Michael Lykoudis, Brett Rocheleau, Claire Sokas, Warren vonEschenbach,

Observers present: Kevin Barry, Earl Carter, Chuck Hurley,

Guests: Kevin Abbott—OIT, Brandon Roach—Assistant General Counsel, OGC

1. Welcome and opening prayer: Father Jenkins opened the meeting, welcomed members to the new academic year, and invited Dean Carolyn Woo to deliver the opening prayer. Following the prayer, new members were introduced.

2. Approval of minutes:

Minutes of the May 17, 2011 meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Election of Executive Committee of the Academic Council

Professor Pope-Davis introduced Kevin Abbott, Office of Information Technology, to conduct the electronic election procedures. Names of candidates for the Executive Committee had already been nominated. The elected candidates were Diane Parr Walker, Hugh Page, Laura Carlson, John Coughlin, and Greg Sterling.

Father Jenkins then appointed three members, giving weight to creating a Committee which has balanced representation across the university. The appointed members were Peter Kilpatrick, William Nichols, and Graham Lappin.

Father Jenkins thanked all for their willingness to serve the university in this capacity.

4. Proposed minor revisions to the Academic Articles

Prof. Pope-Davis invited Brandon Roach, Office of the General Counsel, to present the changes proposed to the Academic Articles. The sections under consideration were Article III, Section 8(c), Section 6(a) and Section 6(b).

Mr. Roach explained that the changes proposed are intended to align the language used in the section which pertains to appeals of a denial for reappointment and/or tenure by a Teaching and Research faculty member with the language in the section that details the dismissal for serious cause and appeals process in the case of a dismissal for serious cause. In the case of an appeal of either a dismissal or a denial of reappointment, a hearing committee will be formed (applies also to SPF reappointment/tenure appeals).

The change being made today refers to the release of the concerned faculty member's name. The desired change would make clear that prior to the formation of the hearing committee, the grounds for the appeal will be revealed but not the name of the faculty member initiating the appeal. The name will be revealed after the hearing committee is formed in order that any necessary recusals can be made; at that time, confidentiality documents are signed. This change makes the language consistent between the two related sections of the Articles.

Prof. Pope-Davis reported that in every instance in which a request for appeal has been filed, each filer has asked to have his/her name withheld. This change is making explicit in the Articles the practice which is being followed at the University.

Chris Mazier asked if there is any potential liability for the university arising from the possibility that the identity of the appealing faculty member may be ascertainable from the details of the case. Mr. Roach stated that there is no liability in that situation.

The motion to accept these changes was made and seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Father Jenkins accepted the changes to the Academic Articles, and thanked Mr. Roach for his presentation.

5. Academic Council Committee 2010-2011 Year-end Reports

Undergraduate Studies Committee, Hugh Page, chair:

At the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year, members of the Undergraduate Studies Committee identified three issues as deserving of attention:

1. Completion of Academic Code revisions
2. Advanced Placement credit
3. Regulations governing the completion and awarding of dual undergraduate degrees

Of these, the committee members were unanimous in identifying the first as most pressing, receiving the committee's full and undivided attention. At the same time, members continued to collect background information the AP credit and dual degree issues, and discussed both as time allowed.

The completion of the Code revision process took the majority of the 16 meetings held during this time period. A consensus was reached to separate the Code into discrete codes for Undergraduates, Graduate Students, and Professional Students. This resulted in a restructuring and culling of the current code to create a new document, a Graduate Academic Code. Before bringing this new document to the Council, conversations were held with Dean Sterling of the Graduate School, the General Counsel, and others about the implications of this strategy.

There were no major objections or legal impediments, so the new Code was brought to the Academic Council for a vote, and unanimously approved on May 17, 2011. Also brought forward at that time were revisions to the Academic Code Honor Handbook. These changes were proposed by Associate Provost Dennis Jacobs and the University Honor Code Committee; they were presented to and endorsed by the Undergraduate Studies Committee on May 2, 2011.

Throughout the year, the Undergraduate Studies Committee was apprised of discussions and work ongoing in university standing committees that report to the Academic Council through the committee. These include the Faculty Board on Athletics, the University Committee on Admissions, Scholarships and Financial Aid, the University Committee on International Studies, and the University Committee on the First Year of Studies. The final reports for these bodies for academic year 2010-2011 are appended to this report for archival purposes. Each chair will be invited to discuss these reports with the new membership of the Undergraduate Studies Committee during one of its Fall, 2011 meetings.

Advanced Studies Committee, John Gaski for chair Panos Antsaklis:

In the absence of chair Antsaklis, John Gaski gave the committee report. In the academic year 2010-2011, the committee approved four new academic programs. These are: a doctoral program and professional master's program in Applied and Computational Mathematics and Statistics, a master's of science program in Global Health, and a doctoral program in Integrative Biomedical Sciences. All were approved by the Academic Council.

The main labor of the committee was focused on the revision of the Post Doctoral Appointments policy. Important input and groundwork was provided by the Office of Research, the Graduate School, Human Resources, and the Faculty Senate. Special recognition goes to Liz Rulli, of the Office of Research, and Chris Mazier, of the Provost's Office. Prof. Gaski also noted that Prof. Antsaklis was 'absolutely heroic' in sheparding this policy from inception to final product.

The committee also began to take up the issue of Residence Life—in particular, housing- for all advanced studies students. Graduate student Kelly Martin was particularly instrumental in bringing this topic forward, through a report she made to the committee. The committee recommends that the Office of Student Affairs undertake a study of the residence life needs of graduate and professional students, to ascertain the housing and other services for this population, which may have a direct impact upon the university's attractiveness to prospective students. One preliminary idea which was attractive to the committee was for the university to consider ways to improve the local rental housing situation for students.

The annual reports of the standing university committees are incorporated into the committee's report. These are the Graduate Council, the University Committee on Research and Sponsored Programs, and the University Council for Academic Technologies.

Faculty Affairs, Ann Tenbrunsel, chair:

The committee addressed four issues, two of which were hold-overs from previous academic years.

1. Special Professional Faculty classification, which was derived from revision process for the Academic Articles
2. Conflict of commitment policy.
3. Revisions to the Academic Articles: committee definitions.
4. Revisions to the Academic Articles: severe sanctions for serious cause.

Because of ongoing structural issues, the committee decided to split into two subgroups to handle these four issues (group A took on issues 1 and 2; group B took on issues 3 and 4). In the past, it has been difficult to make progress on issues such as 1 and 2, because of the calendar and deadline requirements. Issues such as these which have been carried over from year to year are often taken up by the committee in January, as secondary topics. The time frame available for meaningful work is foreshortened, as issues often need to be reviewed and approved by external groups before being brought before the Academic Council. Frequently there is insufficient time to achieve this between January and May of any academic year.

On issue one, SPF classification, the committee recommends that a standing committee be established outside of Faculty Affairs, in order to address this issue which is too big for the structural limits (see above) of this committee. A draft, removing administration and adding creative work (vote:12-2), was circulated among the deans' council, the colleges, the schools, and the Faculty Senate, garnering a lot of feedback. The committee's vote split 5-5 on the draft revision, leaving the next step to the next FA committee.

On issue two, the conflict of commitment, a good working draft was produced, with thanks especially to John Robinson and Jim Seida, to be taken up by the new committee. Again, the committee recommended that a standing committee be formed.

On issue three, revision of committee definitions in the Academic Articles, many minor changes and two major changes (established term limits for PAC; redefined term limits for FBA) were made. These changes were presented to the full Academic Council on May 17, 2011 and unanimously approved.

On issue four, revision of the language on 'severe sanctions for serious cause' in the Academic Articles, a good working draft was prepared; it awaits revision by the next committee or a standing committee.

Another structural issue that could be addressed is the question of how to properly vet drafts of issues which need to be presented to other campus entities. It was suggested that perhaps a website or listserv might assist. The subcommittees of FA met with other campus groups multiple times to collect and discuss feedback; Prof. Tenbrunsel noted that this must be the procedure for most committees. Developing a more streamlined system would be helpful to keeping these procedures on track and moving smoothly forward.

Father Jenkins accepted the reports of the committee chairmen, and thanked all members of the committees for their hard work during 2010-2011.

The meeting was adjourned, and the subcommittees convened.

Next meeting: Tuesday, October 25, 3:30-5:30, Mendoza, Room 161.