

3-22-2006

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2006-03-01

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee, "Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2006-03-01" (2006).
All Committee Minutes. Paper 11.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/11

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

[Approved March 22, 2006]

Minutes

FACAS meeting 3/1/06

Present: D. Biers, G. Doyle, P. Johnson, E. Gustafson, T. Lasley, C. Phelps (chair), B. Turk, L. Hausmann

Absent: A. Abueida, M. Mullins, L. Kloppenberg, P. Thimmes

Guests: J. Untener, T. Washington

Prior to the meeting a second draft of the faculty background check policy was received from the Provost's office and distributed to the committee. The agenda for the meeting was to meet with Mr. Joe Untener and Mr. Troy Washington to discuss the new draft. In addition to the second draft, a release form provided by the company who would be conducting the background checks was also given to the committee. The committee presented a number of concerns and suggestions regarding the next draft which included the following:

- "Crime" is not well-defined. Could a list of crimes or exemplars which would exclude one from consideration for employment be generated? SOEAP has such a list and T. Lasley agreed to forward that to the Provost's office.
- Release form is too encompassing and should be more limited. Additionally, because the release form also provides opportunity for self-disclosure, the release forms should be sent directly to the Provost's office rather than the department chair.
- The right to dispute results of the background check should be expressed to candidates earlier in the process
- What about part-time faculty? Should at least an Ohio check be conducted?
- Under the guidelines for new hires, does the phrase "other instructional positions" imply that current faculty could be asked to undergo a background check if their current position within the University changes?
- Under the verification of background checks, the process which occurs following reception of the background check in the Provost's office needs to be more carefully articulated.

Mr. Untener and Mr. Washington expressed appreciation for the consultation with both the full Senate and the FACAS. The next draft will be forward to the FACAS and as soon as possible. It is anticipated that it will be presented to the Senate in the April meeting.