

9-13-2007

## Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-09-13

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Faculty Affairs Committee, "Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-09-13" (2007).  
*All Committee Minutes*. Paper 23.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/23](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/23)

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](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

Minutes: FACAS Meeting, 9/13/07

Time and Location: 10:30 – 11:45 am, KL 505

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

Absent: C. Letavec

1. The minutes from 9/6/07 and 9/13/07 were approved.
2. Three and two faculty members attended the open meeting discussion on the Promotion and Tenure Policy on Tuesday and Wednesday, respectively. There were no particular problems raised.
3. Discussion continued on the Post-tenure Review Policy
  - a. The document should make clear that the reason the university is establishing a functional Post-tenure Review Policy is that as professionals we are responsible for peer review.
  - b. Should mention that there are already three faculty reviews in place: promotion, sabbatical, and year-end activities report. These can be used in or substituted for a PTR.
  - c. It was noted that in some departments, a request for a sabbatical does not entail much of a review.
  - d. It would be worthwhile to have a review the year before the sabbatical to help the faculty member in determining what the sabbatical may accomplish.
  - e. It was suggested that the “review” be a look-forward rather than back. While it would be necessary to consider the faculty members activities over the previous years, it would be more important to discuss the future. Does the faculty member desire to continue on the same path, or does he or she wish to venture into new areas? The review committee can act as a sounding board and make suggestions.
  - f. It was suggested that the review be a “Post-tenure Peer Consultation,” the purpose being to help the faculty member to set long-term goals.
  - g. The review committee must ask critical questions to determine needs for developmental activities.
  - h. To get resources, is some type of documentation needed to show that the faculty-member and review committee discussed the situation and agreed upon a developmental path? In most cases the documentation will simply state that the review was accomplished and no significant developmental activities or resources are needed.
  - i. Is documentation necessary to establish faculty member’s goals are consistent with department/unit/university goals?
  - j. Developmental activities should not be viewed as correcting a deficiency.
  - k. Do not relay any information on deficiencies to administrators, because such information could be used for punitive actions.

- l. While departments will establish the substantive nature of the review, there must be a degree of consistence across departments, especially in a unit.
  - m. Pat Johnson and Rebecca Wells will put together a draft of a policy.
4. The next meeting will be at 10:30 am on Thursday, September 20, 2007 in KL 505.