

11-8-2007

## Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2007-11-08

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 2007-11-08" (2007).  
*All Committee Minutes*. Paper 29.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_cmte\\_mins/29](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/29)

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, 11/08/07

Time and Location: 10:30 – 11:45 am, KL 533

Present: D. Biers, G. Doyle (chair), E. Gustafson, P. Johnson, T. Lasley, L. Laubach, D. Sink, L. Snyder, R. Wells, S. Wilhoit (Faculty Board)

Absent: C. Letavec, Y. Raffoul

1. The minutes from 11/01/07 were approved as corrected.
2. It was decided to add a discussion on accountability based how UD's faculty performance might be compared to outside institutions.
3. Section 1 (the philosophy) of the Post-tenure Consultation document was edited.
4. Based on the negative reception at the past Senate meeting, a long discussion was held asking what can we do to get the Senate to accept a consultation policy, do we really need to have the policy, or is there something already in place at UD that satisfies a post-tenure review? The following comments were offered.
  - a. While the FAC was attempting to make the policy collegial, some in the Senate thought any post-tenure policy may cause discord among the faculty.
  - b. Is it important to have peer review, or can we go with administrative review?
  - c. A couple members of the FAC thought that faculty at other universities found the post-tenure review to be difficult to implement in a meaningful way. George Doyle will check with Joe Untener again to determine what our 25 peer schools are doing.
  - d. It was suggested that we clearly state the values of the peer consultation, and ask the Senate if they will buy into those values. If they buy in, we can continue with defining the process.
  - e. We already have annual reviews of the faculty by administrators that are evaluative. Should peers play a part in those reviews? Or should peers do a separate developmental consultation?
  - f. Since administrators perform evaluative reviews, is it worthwhile for peers to be involved in developmental reviews?
5. The FAC thought it was best to have a meeting with the Provost to answer some of the above questions. Dave Biers will set up a meeting time and place to discuss the impasse we have found ourselves in.
6. The next meeting is up in the air at the moment.