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Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate
Meeting Minutes
February 28, 2012, 1:30 – 3:00PM St. Mary’s 113B

Present: Partha Banerjee, Pat Donnelly (ex-officio), Linda Hartley (chair), Emily Hicks, Sheila Hughes, Arthur Jipson, Kevin Kelly, Caroline Merithew, Andrea Seielstad, Paul Vanderburgh, Rebecca Wells
Excused: Corinne Daprano, Kaitlin Regan, and Kim Trick

1) The minutes of the previous meeting of the Faculty Affairs Committee were discussed and approved. Minutes will be distributed. Minutes from 02-15 were approved with the addition of Paul Vanderburgh in attendance. FAC minutes for Monday, March 12th 3pm will be taken by Partha Banersjee.

2) Discussion on Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Proposal
A. A vigorous discussion of the SET proposal ensued. The need to separate the SET proposal from the process was discussed by committee members. The SET document reviewed in the previous Academic Senate meeting focused upon consideration of the following items:
   1. Need to develop instrument and process for administrative formal review
   2. Need to consider the delivery method – internet or other form of delivery
   3. Need to have a form that can be flexible for instructors.
B. Questions then regarding online administration of SET were considered. While there appears to be evidence that there is student enthusiasm for an online survey, an instrument must have proper handling and security. Committee members commented on various online mechanisms. Concerns were raised that the labor requirements of online delivery of SET may become expensive and thus hinder an online evaluation instrument. Another concern was raised that the value related to the gathering of qualitative SET data is an important factor in the design as well.
C. The charge of the FAC on SET was reviewed. The Chair of the FAC noted that the Academic Senate is voting on the proposal to create a new committee to establish the new SET process, not to create that process here.
E. The discussion then focused on the specific concerns noted by senators from the previous Academic Senate meeting; such as the need to keep both formative and summative elements in the SET proposal. The future SET committee will need to provide feedback and support for faculty development as well as establish the new process and potential instrument. Recommendations for resources will need to be clearly identified by this new committee. Several committee members noted that clarification on such recommendations may resolve some of the concerns that were voiced in the Academic Senate.
F. The subcommittee will make revisions which will be reviewed by the FAC before submitting the revised SET document to ECAS. The chair reminded the FAC members that the next Academic Senate Meeting is Friday, March 16th.

3) The FAC members then began a discussion of the documents on faculty responsibility guidelines (document available on the FAC group in porches). Several comments were made by committee members:
   1. Last paragraph on page 1 edited – word changed to allocation
   2. Under each area of responsibility there are specific guidelines relating to expectations – baselines are dependent upon the unit (with the understanding that these baselines must meet University of Dayton policies).
a. 18 hour baseline – assumption with flexibility and variation
b. 18 hour baseline is tied to mission
c. Should teaching expectations be stated more directly and earlier in the document?
d. Need to avoid tenure and promotion policies in this document – only state that these policies are in agreement/compliance with tenure and promotion policy documents in the units. This document cannot tell the units how to define the policies. Each unit must have their own workload guideline – units should make standards explicit – standards of scholarship, teaching, and service.
e. Committee members discussed how to measure research productivity – such as at the Unit and Department level. Committee members agreed that workload in research and service are not parallel to teaching and thus the document needed to be edited accordingly. Discussion then focused on the evaluation of research and teaching performed by the Unit Dean and Chair of the Department. Is the faculty member, under consideration, performing well enough to have a three-three teaching load? Should a department have a statement on workload expectations? Should a range be assigned?
f. An important point was raised toward the end of the meeting on guidelines for Library faculty; if this document is to cover workload of all tenured and tenure-track faculty, perhaps a section on librarianship is necessary. The differences in roles and work for some faculty, including the library faculty need to be included. A list of the work and support actions for student learning regularly performed by librarians needs to be added.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00.
Respectfully Submitted by Art Jipson