Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate
2007-05-24

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes: FACAS Meeting 5/24/07

Time and Location: 10:00 – 11:20 am, KL 533

Present: D. Biers, G. Doyle (chair), P. Johnson, L. Laubach, D. Sink, L, R. Wells

Absent: E. Gustafson (sabbatical), T. Lasley, Craig Letavec, L Snyder

FAC Meetings for Fall 2007

Based on availability of the FAC members, it was decided that the fall meetings would be on Thursdays at 10:30 am.

P & T Open Meetings for Faculty

Open meetings for the faculty to discuss the recently passed P&T document will be held in KU 222 at the following times and staffed by:

Tuesday, September 11, 2007 at 3:00 – 4:00 pm (D. Biers and R. Wells)

Wednesday, September 12 at 3:00 – 4:00 pm (G. Doyle and P. Johnson)

Faculty Voting for P&T Document

The faculty will be asked to vote on the P&T document during the week of September 17 to 24, 2007. Dave Biers will coordinate the voting with the Provost office.

George Doyle will sent an email to the deans asking them to encourage the chairs to meet with their faculty to discuss the Promotion and Tenure document before the voting takes place, and to inform them of the open meetings.

Response of Board of Trustees

Dave Biers met with members of the Board of Trustees. They expressed satisfaction with the Promotion and Tenure document passed by the Academic Senate in April, 2007.

When asked about what the board expected from a post-tenure review, they were unsure. However, a letter will be forthcoming to Dave Biers explicating objectives of a post-tenure review.

Comment from Provost

The Provost suggested some uniformity across departments should be one objective of the post-tenure review process.

Post-tenure Review Discussion
A series of ideas were thrown around about the PTR.

1. The PTR should take advantage of any extensive review that is presently done by peers such as for promotion or sabbatical. While a promotional review would be extensive, sabbatical reviews may not be. If a tenured faculty member has not had an extensive peer review in a number of years, the department should form a PTR committee for that individual. Yearly evaluations may be as part of the PTR.

2. The chair should not be part of the PTR process. A second opinion is needed.

3. Results of the PTR would be presented to the department chair in the form of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If the PTR is unsatisfactory than a developmental process would be initiated. If the developmental process does not work, than a third process would commence, possibly leading to salary modification or dismissal.

4. Methods of determining competency may include:
   a. attending faculty’s classes
   b. reviewing class material and tests
   c. performing an equivalent to “Midterm Instructional Diagnosis”
   d. reading scholarly work

Next meeting: 10:30 am, Thursday, August 23, 2007