

9-6-2007

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-09-06

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 2007-09-06" (2007).
All Committee Minutes. Paper 22.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/22

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.

Minutes: FACAS Meeting, 9/6/07

Time and Location: 10:30 – 11:30 am, KL 505

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

Absent: T. Lasley, C. Letavec

1. Several corrections were suggested for the minutes of 8/30/07. They will be made and submitted for approval at the next meeting.

2. The announcements and open discussion meetings for the Promotion and Tenure Policy document were discussed. Everything seems in order, except possible corrections to a PowerPoint presentation developed by Carolyn Roecker Phelps. Pat Johnson will review the PowerPoint and make necessary corrections. Pat reported 9/6/07 pm that she found nothing wrong with the PowerPoint.

3. Discussions on the general tone of the Post-tenure Review Policy continued. The following comments were offered.

a. Maybe it should be called Post-tenure Mentoring or Post-tenure Peer Mentoring.

b. The PTR document should set parameters; the units/departments should set process.

Consider:

“This policy provides guidelines for periodic review for procedural consistency and clarity of substantive criteria both at the unit and department levels.”

c. Tie the review to the sabbatical. The review is done the year prior to the sabbatical.

d. There are a number of good points in “Meyer’s Report.” We should incorporate the ideas into the PTR policy.

e. First outline various post-tenure evaluations that presently take place.

f. Must consider 1976 policy passed by the faculty. The new policy would supersede or replace the 1976 policy.

g. It would be good to have a faculty vote on the new policy, so there is ownership.

h. Stating AAUP guidelines is a good idea.

i. Stress that the new policy is not an evaluation. It should be viewed as a collegial exercise among the faculty.

j. If there is no follow-up, why should faculty care?

4. The next meeting will be at 10:30 am on Thursday, September 13, 2007 in KL 505.