

9-27-2007

## Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-09-27

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 2007-09-27" (2007).  
*All Committee Minutes*. Paper 25.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/25](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/25)

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, 9/27/07

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 9/20/07 were approved.
2. Draft 3 of 9/21/07 was edited. The following ideas were discussed.
  - a. It was suggested that a rough draft be presented to the Board of Trustees to make sure the board was in “agreement” with our approach. It was felt that we would submit the first part of the draft only – the part discussing the philosophy of our approach. The particulars are still in the state of flux, and may vary significantly from our present thinking. There is a Board of Trustees meeting on Oct 17/18.
  - b. It was agreed that this policy should reflect the faculty’s desires pertaining to any type of post-tenure review, and not necessarily the board’s position. On the other hand, if the board does not like the faculty’s (FAC) view on post-tenure review, they might not approve the Promotion and Tenure Policy just passed by the faculty. Then we are at an impasse.
  - c. Should get some feedback from the Executive Committee soon.
  - d. Should have an open meeting with the faculty before presenting this policy to the Senate – need buy-in.
  - e. Should make sure that the post-tenure peer consultation document emphasizes that there are administrative policies to deal with punitive actions.
  - f. This document must emphasize that it is peer consultation for developmental purposes only -- no punitive consequence.
  - g. It was agreed that the section on the AAUP’s guidelines on post-tenure review was fine as written, and also pertinent to the FAC’s approach to this policy.
  - h. Departments/units may determine what substantive material is required for the review, but must not include internal evaluative material unless desired by the faculty member.
  - i. External evaluative reviews may be submitted by the faculty member to demonstrate positive feedback from outside peers (organizations).
  - j. The consultation committee should be at least three tenured faculty members, with at least one member external to the faculty member’s department/unit.
  - k. One committee member should be chosen by the faculty member.
  - l. The consultation process should be tied closely to the sabbatical leave timetable. It should be done the year before the faculty member submits a sabbatical proposal.
  - m. The consultation process will not be necessary if the faculty member has recently completed a promotion or an endowed chair review.